The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVIII, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1953

CONTENTS

The Obligation of Professing the Faith. Part I
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 81

The Cajetan Controversy . . . *Thomas Aquinas Collins, O.P.* 90

Mlle. De Soulfour and the Bishop of Geneva
Richard W. Rousseau, S.J. 101

The Christian Rational Basis for World Order
Aidan Carr, O.F.M. Conv. 109

Our Lady of Fatima and the Scapular
Norman G. Werling, O.Carm. 117

A Good Friday Meditation on the Way of the Cross
Nicholas P. Connolly 122

"The Work of Thy Hands" . . . . . *Charles J. Galloway, S.J.* 128

Marian Studies . . . . . *Bernard Le Frois, S.V.D.* 133

A Protestant Discussion of a Catholic Dogma
Joseph Clifford Fenton 136

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Use of the Biretta 143

Extreme Unction Unconsciously Received by the Conscious 143

The Repetition of Extreme Unction 145

Holy Communion on Holy Saturday 146

Blessing of Sacred Vessels 147

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Services for Non-Catholics 147
Benediction Problem 148
Absolution after Funeral Mass 148
Preaching at Mass 149
Large Votive Candles 149
Sanctuary Lamp 149
Lavabo Dish 150
National Anthem in Church 150

BOOK REVIEWS

The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, *by John Tracy Ellis* 151
From an Abundant Spring. The Walter Farrell Memorial Volume 155
Vocation, *translated by Walter Mitchell* 156
The Life of Christ, *by Giuseppe Ricciotti* 157
The Sociology of the Parish. *Edited by Celestine J. Nuesse and Thomas J. Harte* 159

For over 40 years—

CATHOLIC EDUCATORS AND PRIESTS HAVE KNOWN THE VALUE OF

The Catholic Educational Review

Edited under the direction of

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Department of Education

SOME RECENT CONTENTS:

- **John Dewey, Prophet of American Naturalism** . **Rev. John A. Hardon, S.J.**
- **Group Techniques in Vocational Guidance** . . . . **Bro. Leo V. Ryan, C.S.V.**
- **Literature for Christian Family Living** . . . . **Sr. M. Margaret Mary, B.V.M.**
- **St. Thomas Aquinas and the Ideals of a Teacher** **Rev. Thomas C. Donlan, O.P**
- **Integrating Mathematics in the Catholic College** . . **Sr. M. Claudia, O.S.F.**
- **The Contact Speech Program** . . . . . **Sr. Ignatius Marie, S.N.D.**

Education Problems, Projects, Techniques — Abstracts — News from the educational field — Notes — Book Reviews — Covers the Elementary, High School, and College Levels.

Published monthly from September through June.

Subscription Price: **U. S., Canada and Foreign $4.00**

Single Number 40 cents

Address: THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE OBLIGATION OF PROFESSING THE FAITH

PART I

Our Divine Saviour very emphatically declared that His followers have an obligation of professing before the world their Christian faith and their loyalty to Him: "Everyone who acknowledges Me before men, I also will acknowledge him before My Father in heaven."[1] St. Paul also indicated the need of the external manifestation of belief in Christianity, as distinct from internal assent, when he said: "With the heart a man believes unto justice, and with the mouth profession of faith is made unto salvation."[2] The Catholic Church has always impressed on her members their grave obligation of making open acknowledgment of their faith when circumstances demand it, and has conferred the highest honors of the altar on those who professed their fidelity to Christ and to His Church at the cost of their lives. The dignity and the merit which the Catholic Church has always attributed to martyrdom are the reward of the heroism which the martyrs exercised in obeying Our Lord's command to acknowledge Him before men.

The spirit of valor and of loyalty to Christ which aided the martyrs to profess the faith is also called for in Catholics of our times. In the lands now dominated by the tyranny of atheistic Communism death may be the penalty for proclaiming allegiance to the Catholic Church. Even in a land such as the United States, where the government guarantees it citizens full liberty to profess and to practice their faith, occasions can arise in the course of daily life which demand of a Catholic the willingness to make great sacrifices if he would be staunch in professing his faith. Hence, it is necessary that all Catholics, both clergy and laity, understand clearly the nature and the scope of the obligation of professing the faith and the ways in which they are bound to fulfill it.

We are now concerned with the *divine* precept of professing the faith. The legislation of the Church on the duty of making a formal profession of faith will be considered in a subsequent article. Like many other precepts of divine law, this command to profess our

[1] *Matt.* 10:32. [2] *Rom.* 10:10.

faith has both a negative and an affirmative aspect, to which we can apply the theological axiom: "A negative precept binds *semper et ad semper;* an affirmative precept binds *semper sed non ad semper.*" Freely translated and applied to the question at hand, this means that while we may never deny our faith, we need not always profess it.

In this article we shall study the negative aspect of the obligation of professing the faith, leaving to a following article the consideration of its affirmative aspect.

1. THE DENIAL OF THE TRUE FAITH

From the negative standpoint the divine precept with which we are concerned forbids a Catholic to deny his Catholic faith or to profess a non-Catholic religious creed. It makes no difference whether this is done in words or in deeds, explicitly or implicitly, seriously or fictitiously. The reason underlying this strict and unqualified prohibition is that one who denies the true religion or professes a false religion by that very fact rejects the authority of the all-wise and all-truthful God, the motive of divine faith.

There is no parvity of matter possible in the violation of this commandment, since it is always a heinous act of disrespect to God to spurn His authority. A mortal sin is committed whether one denies the entire content of divine revelation or a single article of the faith. However, if the denial is merely external—in other words, if a Catholic expresses disbelief in the doctrines of Christian revelation, though he continues to hold them firmly in his soul, as would be the case of one who denies the faith through human respect—he does not lose the virtue of divine faith. For the sin committed in such an event would be only indirectly against the virtue, though it would be *ex toto genere suo* a mortal sin. As Noldin says: "A pretended denial of the faith is a falsehood that is insulting to God and harmful to one's neighbor because of the scandal; hence the Church regards even the merely external denial of the faith as a grave sin. Accordingly, though one who only exteriorly denies the faith is not a heretic and does not lose the habit of faith, since he retains faith internally, nevertheless he sins against a negative precept of the faith."[3]

[3] Noldin, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Innsbruch, 1938), II, n. 19.

Not even to avoid death may one deny the Catholic faith, even though the denial is merely external. In every widespread persecution of the Church there have been some who yielded to the fear of imprisonment or death to the extent of renouncing their belief in Catholic teaching. Thus, in the third century, when the Roman Emperors were making every effort to destroy Christianity, there were some members of the Church who bribed the civil officials to give them certificates attesting that they had abjured Christianity. The Church regarded these *libellatici* as public sinners, even though it was evident that they had resorted to this measure only through fear of death.[4] Beyond doubt some Catholics behind the Iron Curtain are purchasing safety today at the same price, and, however much we may sympathize with their sad predicament, their conduct must be regarded as a grave sin, though possibly in some instances they may be drugged or abused to such a degree that the sin is only a material transgression of God's law.

A fortiori, there is no excuse for the Catholic who denies his faith in order to secure a lucrative position in politics or business. For example, a candidate for political office, anxious to obtain the support of non-Catholic voters, might find it convenient to express views implying a denial of the Catholic doctrine of the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation. Even though he thereby won the election, he would have succeeded through a gravely sinful means.

Even if the denial of the faith were intended as a practical joke, it would still be unlawful. Thus, if a Catholic, wishing to play a joke on a priest-friend, tells him gravely that he no longer believes in the infallibility of the Pope, he is guilty of violating the precept we are considering, even though he intends in a few minutes to make it clear that he is only jesting. In other words, just as the very act of reviling God is blasphemy and a serious sin, even though the person pronouncing the words aims only at deceiving the hearers into thinking that he means it, so the very act of denying the true faith is intrinsically evil, however innocent may be the ultimate purpose of the one who enunciates the denial.

Of course, this is to be understood of one who is speaking in his own name; for if one assumes the person of another, his state-

[4] Cf. *DTC,* 13, 678.

ments are not necessarily sinful, even though they are materially blasphemous or contrary to the doctrines of the faith. Thus, to narrate what another said in denial of the Christian faith, or to act the part of an apostate or a heretic in a play is not wrong because it is clearly understood that the speaker or actor is merely repeating or portraying the words or deeds of another character, either real or fictitious, not his own ideas or mode of conduct. This same principle might exonerate from serious sin the joker who visits a priest (who does not know him) and pretends to be an unbeliever, makes statements derogatory to the faith, etc., with the idea of eventually revealing himself as a Catholic and getting a laugh out of the incident. In such an event, I believe, the fact that the visitor assumes the person of a fictitious individual and makes his statements in the name of this character may excuse him from the formal sin of denying the faith. I express this view hesitatingly, because one might conclude from it that at times a person could pretend to be a non-Catholic to the extent of participating actively in heretical worship, without thereby committing a sin against the profession of faith; and such a conclusion would be entirely false.

In this same connection a question might arise as to the lawfulness of a false statement in regard to one's religious beliefs, in view of a probable opinion concerning the malice of falsehood. Some Catholic scholars have held that in the event that an attempt is being made to extort unjustly from a person information which he has a right to keep secret, he may use a downright falsehood to protect his secret, if no other means will avail.[5] It might be asked why a Catholic could not use this opinion by denying that he is a Catholic when unjust pressure is being put on him to make him reveal his religious affiliation by persons having no right to the information, who will persecute him if they discover that he is a member of the Catholic Church. It might be the case of a Catholic girl who is seeking a post as school teacher in a section where bigotry is very strong. She is fully qualified for the position, she knows that it is unjust to exclude her merely because of her Catholic faith; but she is convinced that if she answers truthfully the question concerning her religion she will not obtain the position.

[5] Cf. Dorszynski, *Catholic Teaching about the Morality of Falsehood* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948).

By an application of the opinion, just mentioned, could she make use of a falsehood as a justifiable means of self-defense and say that she is not a Catholic?

The answer is unquestionably: No. The theory just described is based on the principle that the chief purpose of speech is to aid human society by promoting mutual trust among men; hence, in the exceptional case when society will be better aided by a falsehood—that is, when a falsehood is the only means available of protecting a person against an unjust attack on his secrets—a falsehood may be employed. Fr. Dorszynski in his excellent dissertation on this question explains it thus: "We realize that deceptive speech *ordinarily* harms mutual trust in society; but we maintain that there are times when it may be used without injury to mutual trust. One of the times it does not endanger that trust is when it is employed to protect a lawful secret from unjust aggression. We believe that in a conflict of the rights of the speaker and hearer we could aptly apply the usual rules involved in cases of unjust aggression of life and property."[6]

However, when a statement involves the rights of God, and not merely the rights of human beings, when the honor of the Almighty rather than the defense of an individual is at stake, nothing will justify the use of falsehood, even though a denial of the faith is the only means of avoiding death. The Catholic girl in the case given above could refuse to answer the interrogation concerning her religious beliefs, but under no circumstances may she state that she is not a Catholic.

Catholic doctrine embraces other truths besides those contained in divine revelation—namely, truths of the natural order having some connection with the content of revelation. These the Church may propose infallibly—for example, through an *ex cathedra* definition of the Sovereign Pontiff—and they thus become the object of ecclesiastical faith.[7] Furthermore, there are doctrines taught authoritatively, but not infallibly, by the Church. For instance, the Popes frequently teach in this manner in their Encyclicals. These latter teachings must be accepted by Catholics with religious as-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

[7] Cf. Van Noort, *Tractatus de fontibus revelationis* (Bussum, Holland, 1920), p. 175.

sent.[8] While the denial of such doctrines would not be as serious a fault as the denial of a doctrine of divine faith, it would seem to be a mortal sin to deny one of them, even merely externally. For, while such a denial does not directly involve the rejection of God's authority, it involves the rejection of the authority of the Church, and the irreverence of such an act is so great that it exceeds any benefit that might come to the individual making the denial and constitutes a mortal sin.

2. THE ADMISSION OF A FALSE CREED

From the moral standpoint the profession of a religious creed containing anything contrary to Catholic belief is specifically the same sin as the denial of the true faith. This principle holds good whether the profession of the false religion is explicit or implicit, in word or in deed. Thus, if a Catholic takes an active part in a public act of heretical worship he is reasonably believed to be making an implicit act of belief in the creed of this sect, which logically involves the denial of the Catholic faith. The profession of a false religion is gravely sinful even when the one who makes the profession does not actually believe it, but intends only an external acknowledgment. Similarly, the profession of a schismatic religion would be gravely sinful, since a schismatic church is gravely at variance with the law of Christ that all human beings acknowledge and obey the authority of His one Church.

One of the problems relative to this matter that has been extensively discussed by the theologians is the use by Catholics of garments or emblems which are ordinarily used by the adherents of a particular non-Catholic religious group. The teaching of some of the theologians on this problem is somewhat vague and uncertain. However, there seems to be agreement on two general rules. First, if a garment or emblem is so distinctive and exclusive that the wearing of it is inevitably regarded as meaning that the wearer is a member of the denomination in question, it would be sinful to wear it. Secondly, if the garment or emblem has also a lawful use (such as bodily covering), it may be worn by a Catholic, if there is a sufficiently grave reason for doing so. A practical norm is given by Lugo: "As often as the use of garments is such that

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

one who knew the wearer previously would judge without any doubt that he is denying the faith and professing a false religion, their use will never be lawful; but when those who know the wearer can doubt whether the garment is being employed for another end, the use can be lawful for a grave reason, which must be the graver the nearer the garment approaches to a denial of the true faith, judged from the circumstances, although it does not definitely signify this."[9]

From these rules it seems to follow logically that the use of the Masonic pin would never be allowed to Catholics; but on the other hand, the unfortunate individual whose overcoat is stolen on a cold winter night could accept the loan of a kindly Salvation Army man's coat (which surely is distinctive of this religious group) to enable him to get home without freezing. The use of the fez in Turkey is mentioned by theologians as permissible in that country, since besides its religious significance this headgear is employed as a national Turkish garment.[10]

May a Catholic ever make use of the "Masonic grip"? The answer would depend on the particular adjuncts. If those to whom it is given would unhesitatingly regard it as a mark of membership in the Masonic Order—which is an anti-Catholic organization—a person could not use it, even though his only purpose was to receive kind treatment from some individual or group he chanced to meet. But if he is known to be a Catholic by those to whom he gives the "grip," so that their only reaction is to wonder how he acquired a knowledge of this distinctive sign of Masonry, without becoming a member, he would not fail against the prohibition to profess a false creed.

It is hardly necessary to add that the use of even distinctive non-Catholic garments or emblems when one is known to be portraying some other person—as in a play—is not forbidden. Moreover, if a priest denies that he is a priest or a religious that he is a religious he is not guilty of any denial of the faith.

3. THE CONCEALMENT OF THE FAITH

The theologians treat in this connection the *concealment* of one's faith (*occultatio fidei*). The term is not wholly desirable, since it

[9] Lugo, *De fide*, Disp. 14, sect. 5, n. 70.
[10] Cf. S. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis*, Lib. II, n. 15.

seems to have an opprobrious connotation. What is meant is an action or omission of such a nature that an observer will not be inclined to judge that a person is a Catholic, and may even be inclined to believe that he is not a Catholic. Merely to abstain from professing the faith, even when a command to do so is issued by some one not possessing the due authority, is sometimes fully permissible. Thus, if the rulers of a Communist-dominated country ordered all Catholics to register, the purpose being to restrict or to punish those who professed the Catholic faith, there would be no obligation on Catholics to obey this unjust ruling. Similarly, if an anti-Catholic lecturer challenges the Catholics in the audience to come forward and debate with him, the Catholics who happen to be present are doing no wrong if they remain silent.

It is even permitted a Catholic to perform lawful but ambiguous actions, with the prevision that the observers will conclude that he is not a Catholic, when there is a sufficient reason for remaining unknown. Indeed, according to Noldin, there can be occasions when such a method of keeping one's faith unperceived will be a duty—namely, when the profession of faith would occasion dishonor to God (for example, by the blasphemies of unbelievers if a Catholic were discovered) or harm to one's neighbor (for example, through the imprisonment of a priest who is secretly aiding his fellow Catholics).[11] Thus, if a Catholic is passing through a territory where violent hatred of the Church prevails he may eat meat on Friday, in order that his faith may not be discovered. For the Church prescribes abstinence not as a manifestation of faith, but as an act of self-denial, and for grave reasons a Catholic is excused from the observance of this ecclesiastical law.

However, in particular instances the eating of meat on Friday may be regarded as a denial of the faith, and in such circumstances it would be forbidden. For this reason the Congregation of the Propaganda, in 1774, forbade Christians living among the Mahometans to eat food prohibited by the Church, since in doing so "they are judged to be Mahometans among the Mahometans."[12]

Mental restrictions, or amphilogies, also pertain to this matter. Of course, that type of mental restriction in which the true meaning of the speaker is entirely hidden within his mind (a mental restric-

[11] Cf. Noldin, *op. cit.*, II, n. 22. [12] *Coll. S.C.P.F.*, n. 1653.

tion in the strict sense) is forbidden, as a lie.[13] But that type of mental restriction in which the true meaning can be discovered from the words themselves, even though it will probably not be discovered by the hearers (a mental restriction in the broad sense) is permitted for a sufficiently grave reason. The story is told of a young Catholic who, anxious to obtain a job from which he would be unjustly excluded if his religion were known, answered when questioned about his religious affiliation: "I am a member of the Church of God." His statement was literally true, even though his hearers concluded that he belonged to a Protestant denomination. While I would not condemn such an evasion as wrong, I would recommend that a Catholic in such circumstances openly and clearly profess his faith, even though in consequence he will be the victim of bigotry.

CONCLUSION

On the whole, the Catholics of our country are staunch in professing their faith; and they regard those who deny their membership in the Church as cowards, unworthy of the privilege of the true faith. However, there are doubtless some who would look on such a denial as nothing worse than a "business lie" when some profit is to be gained thereby. Hence, priests should clearly instruct their people in the grave malice of this sin, informing them that not even to save their lives may they deny their Catholic faith or profess a false religion. This form of instruction will impress them with the realization that nothing on earth can compare in value with the privilege of membership in the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ and of the possession of the precious gift of divine faith.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[13] *DB*, 1176-77.

THE CAJETAN CONTROVERSY

The object of this paper is to relate the history of a controversy concerning a truly great exegete.[1] It is not my intention to settle the controversy, much less to provoke a new one! The controversy in question concerns the exegetical works of Cardinal Thomas de Vio, O.P., more popularly known as Cajetan. I think it is safe to say that the commentaries of Cajetan on the Books of the Bible are not very well known. This is due, perhaps, to the fact that these commentaries are not easily accessible, especially in this country. Few libraries in America can boast of having them on their shelves.

I became interested in Cajetan's commentaries on the occasion of P. Lagrange's death in 1938. The latter is considered by some to be the greatest Catholic biblical scholar "since Cajetan." On reading this, I was struck by the term of comparison, for I was under the impression that Cajetan's exegetical works were practically worthless. That false impression had been generated, for the most part, by passing references regarding a "condemnation" of Cajetan. I began to investigate the history of that condemnation and the judgment passed on the works of Cajetan by more recent biblical scholars. This paper will contain the more important results of that investigation.

Thomas de Vio was born at Gaeta in 1468. Entering the Dominican Order while still very young, he completed his philosophical and theological studies with great success and was assigned to teach theology at Padua. His superiors quickly recognized his great gifts. In 1497, he was named Procurator-General of the Order. In 1507, he became Vicar-General and in 1508, at the age of forty, he assumed the office of Master General. During his ten years of office, Cajetan injected new life into the Order's program of studies, inspiring all by his own devotion to sacred science. Though busy with the cares of his office, he continued to write his commentary on the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

[1] This paper is substantially the same as that delivered to the members of the Catholic Biblical Association during their meeting at St. Louis, Mo., August, 1950.

Pope Leo X made him a cardinal in 1517 and sent him to Germany as his legate. In 1519, Cajetan returned to Rome, after trying unsuccessfully to win Martin Luther back to the Church. He was then made Bishop of Gaeta, and from 1523 until his death in 1534, the Cardinal led a quiet life devoted to study, especially to the study of Holy Scripture. It was during these last ten years of his life that he composed all his commentaries on the Bible.

He commented on all the books of the Old Testament, up to and including the first three chapters of the book of Isaias, and on all the books of the New Testament except the Apocalypse. It is obvious, therefore, that Cajetan began his scientific study of the Scriptures with at least one great asset: a tremendous grasp of theology, for he had finished his life's work in that sacred science when he undertook to write his exegetical works. Cajetan was a great exponent of the literal sense. In a dedicatory letter to Clement VII, he declared that his object was to determine the true literal sense of Sacred Scripture and to determine this from the original languages. He did not hesitate to adopt new interpretations, provided these were not in conflict with any doctrine of the Church and did no violence to the text and context. This *novus sensus* was to cause the Cardinal a great deal of trouble. We shall have to examine it later in this paper.

Cajetan's firm conviction that a biblical scholar should prefer the original languages to the Latin of the Vulgate also provoked a storm of protests. Unchallenged as the Prince of Commentators on the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas, the Cardinal was not so fortunate with regard to his biblical labors, for he was soon involved in a disastrous controversy with the powerful theological faculty of the University of Paris.

The Protestant revolt, the printing press, and a renewed interest in the study of Hebrew and Greek, all combined to mark the sixteenth century as a century of change. Throwing aside the Vulgate, Protestant scholars took up the study of Holy Scripture in the original languages and used their conclusions to intensify their assault upon the Church of Christ. Of all the great theologians of the period, it seems that only Cardinal Cajetan sensed the necessity of meeting the Protestant exegetes on their own grounds. He determined that he, too, must go back to the original languages. He firmly believed that unless the original text were before the

exegete, no true exegesis would be possible.[2] His numerous commentaries on the books of the Old and New Testaments manifest how clearly Cajetan saw the problems of his age; they manifest also how tenaciously the Cardinal clung to his purpose of meeting the enemy on his own grounds. This purpose of Cajetan is important, for it explains much that is obscure and controversial in his exegetical works.

For almost four hundred years, the exegetical works of Cardinal Cajetan have received unfavorable criticism. The first blow struck at Cajetan came from the Faculty of Theology at Paris. In their faculty session of June 8, 1532, just two years after the publication of Cajetan's commentary on the Psalms, the Masters of the Theological Faculty at Paris were informed by their president that complaints had been registered to them concerning certain doctrines found in the works of Thomas de Vio.[3] Five Masters of the Faculty were assigned the task of drawing up and presenting to their fellow-professors a list of the supposedly erroneous propositions in the Cardinal's exegetical works, while two others were commissioned to see to it that none of these challenged works were sold at Paris until the Faculty had arrived at some decision.

The affair at Paris did not pass unnoticed at Rome. Pope Clement VII, on Sept. 23, 1532, sent a brief to Cardinal Gabriel de Gramont, the Legate to France, demanding that a list of the propositions which the Faculty of Paris had declared to be erroneous be sent to him. The Pope paid tribute to the great work done in behalf of the Church by Cajetan, and instructed the Legate to see to it that attacks on the Cardinal ceased.[4] The Papal brief was delivered to Cardinal Antoine du Prat, the Archbishop of Sens, who issued instructions to the Faculty of Paris. An investigating committee was set up and given the following instructions: they

[2] Cajetan (Thomas de Vio), *Omnia Opera quoquot in sacrae scripturae expositionem reperiuntur, cura atque industria insignis collegii S. Thomae Complutensis, O.P.* (Lyons, 1639), III, 1. (All subsequent references to Cajetan's exegetical works will be according to this edition, unless otherwise noted.)

[3] Fr. M. H. Laurent, O.P., "Quelques documents des archives Vaticanes (1517-1534)," *Revue Thomiste,* 18, 86-87 (Cajetan Memorial *Volume,* 1934-35, p. 112).

[4] Laurent, *op. cit.,* p. 121.

were to draw from the commentaries of Cajetan on the Psalms and the New Testament the propositions which they deemed worthy of condemnation; they were to offer the reasons justifying their choice; finally they were to establish on firm grounds the doctrinal basis for their censure of the propositions chosen.

During the Faculty sessions which followed, Jacque Berthelmy, one of the Masters, proposed to the committee that they approach Cajetan for a possible retraction, since, he argued, it was not fitting to censure so great a prince of the Church without first attempting a reconciliation. The Masters at the session were divided on the proposal, with the result that the Archbishop of Sens was consulted on the matter. The latter replied that not only should a letter be sent to Cajetan, but also a list of the supposedly erroneous propositions.[5] Laurent expresses a doubt as to whether Cardinal Cajetan ever received the propositions drawn up by the Masters of the Theological Faculty of Paris.[6] The doubt of Laurent is well founded, for there is no evidence that Cajetan did receive them, while there is some evidence to support the position that he did not receive them.

This evidence is contained in a reply made by Cajetan to certain letters sent to him by a Master John, regent of a studium in Mainz, Germany.[7] This Master John had included in his letters to Cajetan a list of propositions drawn from the latter's commentaries and censured by the Paris theologians. In his letter, Master John asked Cajetan to prevent the scandal these condemned propositions were likely to cause in Germany by declaring the truth. Cajetan replied that he was happy to oblige and added, "I am sending a response to the list of sixteen articles received by you whose title is: *Articuli Aliquot pro Erroneis a Theologis Parisiensibus ex Libris Cajetani Excepti.*"[8]

The date assigned to this response of Cajetan is Dec. 30, 1534. Though the date is erroneous,[9] since the Cardinal was certainly

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[7] Cajetan, *Opuscula omnia Thomae De Vio Cajetani* (Venice, 1568), p. 298.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

[9] Fr. M. J. Congar, O.P., "La date de la mort du Cardinal Cajetan," *Angelicum* (1934), p. 602.

dead by December of 1534, it indicates that the response must have been written by Cajetan shortly before his death. Now it seems to us that if Cajetan had already refuted the charges made against him by the Paris theologians, Master John could have appealed to that response to avoid any scandal in Germany. Moreover, Cajetan himself would certainly have answered the theologians at Paris directly if they had sent him the propositions in question. Then, on the receipt of the list from Master John, he would have referred the latter to the response he had already made to the charges against him. On the contrary, the general tone of Cajetan's reply to the German Master indicates, at least it seems so to us, that this was the first reply made to charges against the Cardinal. Since this is the only response we know of, we think, with Père Laurent, that it is quite probable that Cajetan never received the list of condemned propositions which the Archbishop of Sens had ordered sent to him.

In the spring of 1534, Cajetan found partisans who were as unexpected as they were undesirable. Certain Lutheran theologians at Wittenberg saw in Cajetan's condemnation by the University of Paris a splendid opportunity to kill two birds with one stone. They made public at Wittenberg in the spring of 1534 a letter written by the Paris theologians to Cajetan wherein he was accused of being so rash as to dare to attempt a translation of the Scriptures from the original languages. The Cardinal was accused of being totally ignorant of Hebrew and little acquainted with Greek. Paris further charged him with holding in his writings teachings which favored the Protestants, and that with these Protestants he had deserted the traditional text of the Bible, the Vulgate. Père Laurent thinks that it was to embarrass both the University of Paris and Cajetan himself that the Lutherans published with this letter of the University of Paris a list of the condemned propositions and inserted also a letter of their own to the Faculty of Theology.[10] Paris, according to the Lutherans, found itself in the peculiar position of having condemned for holding Protestant doctrines the very theologian who had been sent by the Holy See to oppose the teachings of Martin Luther. Cajetan, on the other hand, was embarrassed to find himself supported by the

[10] Laurent, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

theologians of the man he himself had tried in vain to bring back to the true doctrine of Holy Mother Church.

This publication at Wittenberg is extremely valuable, for it has preserved for us a list of the propositions drawn up by the University of Paris, and that list has not otherwise been preserved, as far as this writer knows. Its authenticity can be checked by comparing it with those propositions drawn up by Catharinus from the writings of Cajetan.[11] Laurent[12] believes that the opposition to Cajetan might have ended in the year 1534 if Catharinus had not continued the controversy after the Cardinal's death. During the controversy between the University of Paris and Cardinal Cajetan, in the years 1530-1532, Catharinus was in constant contact with the Paris theologians, but as Allgeier admits, it is difficult to determine his influence upon them during this period of the controversy.[13] The following year, however, after the death of Cajetan, Catharinus published his treatise, *Excerpta quaedam de commentariis Reverendissimi Cardinalis Cajetani S. Xisti,* in which he stated that he had suspected Cajetan for a long time. For instance, he assailed the Cardinal for rejecting the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews, for his opinions concerning the Catholic Epistles, the last chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark, the pericope of the adulterous woman,[14] and also for his opinion on the Canon. Moreover, in the latter part of his work Catharinus accused Cajetan of serious errors concerning the Trinity, Mariology, and the sacraments.[15] He charged the Cardinal with two fundamental errors in biblical studies and claimed that these were the principles of many more errors: (1) he had abandoned the text of the Vulgate without sufficient reason; (2) he had committed a serious error with regard to the senses of Holy Scripture in that he so often rejected the universally accepted literal sense of a certain passage and attributed too little importance generally to the spiritual sense.[16]

[11] Joannis Echius, *Enchiridion locorum communium adversus Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiae* (Lyons, 1563). The appendix of this work contains the complete list of the passages in Cajetan's exegesis criticized by Catharinus.

[12] Laurent, *op. cit.,* p. 119.

[13] Fr. A. Allgeier, O.P., "Les commentaires de Cajetan sur les psaumes," *Revue Thomiste* (1934), p. 429.

[14] *John* 8:1-11.

[15] Allgeier, *op. cit.,* p. 430.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 431.

The attack of Catharinus kept alive the flame of controversy from 1535 to the opening of the Council of Trent in 1545. While the opposition of the Theological Faculty of Paris and the attack of Catharinus formed the chief basis for the unfavorable opinion which Cajetan enjoys regarding his exegetical works, there were other writers who supported the attack. One of these was Melchior Cano (1509-1560), an illustrious disciple of the great Dominican jurist, Francis Vittoria. He succeeded his Dominican confrere and Master at Salamanca, occupying the chair of Theology there from 1546 to 1552.[17] Cano had great classical gifts which he utilized in a new project, that of examining more precisely the revealed foundations of theology. His celebrated work, *De locis theologicis,* was the result of his desire to produce a new method of theological procedure, that of developing a theological thesis from three proofs: Scripture, Tradition, and Reason. While the method of Cano was new, the author of it had little taste for new and novel doctrines.[18] As a matter of fact, it is precisely upon the supposed novelty of Cajetan's doctrine that the criticism of Cano falls.

One of the principles of Cajetan which Cano attacked was the determination of the Cardinal to adhere to the literal sense which he thought to be the true sense of the passage, even though that sense might not be the sense given by the Fathers.[19] This *novus sensus* of Cajetan was to be a constant source of misunderstanding. We shall consider it more in detail later. Cajetan had also enunciated the principle that it was the authority of the original and not that of a version of the Scriptures which compels our assent,[20] and here again Cano severely criticizes him.[21]

In 1891, Cajetan once more received an unwelcome ally. Robert C. Jenkins, M.A., Rector of Lyminge, published a study of the exegetical works of Cajetan entitled, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine, a Review of the Commentary on the Scriptures of Thomas De Vio, Cardinal of St. Xystus, commonly called Cardinal Cajetan.* In this study, Jenkins attempts to prove that in many controversial questions, "Cajetan is far nearer to the Church of England than to the

[17] F. Cayré, *Manual of Patrology* (Paris, 1940), II, 745.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 747.
[19] Cajetan, *op. cit.*, I, *Praefatio in quinque mosaicos libros.*
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] Melchior Cano, *De locis theologicis* (Venice, 1754), I, vii, 395-426.

Church of Rome."[22] He commends the Cardinal for his attitude toward the Vulgate, in words which hardly sound complimentary: "The rude Latin of the Vulgate had not in the days of Cajetan superseded the languages of the original; and he was not afraid of dealing with its errors in a very summary way. The ignorance of Hebrew and Greek which prevailed universally in the Council [Trent], and the knowledge that the mediaeval theology of the Latin Church was founded upon the Vulgate, whose errors were imbedded in the writings of the western divines, conspired to effect the canonization of St. Jerome's version, and indeed to make it a necessary."[23]

Jenkins asserts that Cajetan's noble protests against the very corruptions which had awakened the zeal of Luther have not only taken away the reproach of his earlier life, but have established his reputation as one of the founders of that literal interpretation of the Scripture which was developed more fully by Erasmus and has been handed down ever since even in the Roman Church.[24] Presumably, "the reproach of his earlier life" refers to the mission of Cajetan to bring Martin Luther back to the bosom of Holy Mother Church! But Cajetan repented his folly and therefore merits to be called "a rival or rather fellow-worker with Luther"[25] in the field of exegesis. Casting off the fetters of his earlier education (!), Cajetan devoted himself to the work of expounding the Scriptures in their literal and obvious sense "and with the same freedom from traditional interpretation by which the reformed commentators gave them so new a beauty and so clear a light."[26] No consideration of Cajetan's exegesis would be complete without some comment upon his principle of the *novus sensus*. Jenkins, as we shall see, translated the words of the Cardinal to suit himself. We shall give the text as it is translated by Jenkins and then examine the original Latin.

I entreat all my readers not too suddenly to repudiate anything, but to weigh everything by the Holy Scripture, by the truth of the Christian faith, and by the evidence and the customs of the Catholic Church. And if sometimes a new sense should appear, agreeable to the sacred text

[22] Robert C. Jenkins, *Pre-Tridentine Doctrine* (London, 1891), p. viii.
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] *Ibid.*, p. X.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

and not contrary to the doctrine of the Church, although it be opposed to the whole stream of the sacred doctors, that they will show themselves to be just censors.[27]

According to the text of Jenkins, Cajetan asked indulgence when a sense he proposed was contrary to the common interpretation of the passage given by the Fathers. But is this what Cajetan said? An examination of the Latin text shows clearly that he did not say "although it be opposed to the whole stream of the sacred doctors."

Rogo lectores omnes ne praecipites detestentur aliquid, sed librent omnia apud Sacram Scripturam, apud christianae fidei veritatem, apud Catholicae Ecclesiae documenta ac mores. *Et si quando occurrerit novus sensus textui consonans, nec a Sacra Scriptura, nec ab Ecclesiae doctrina dissonus quamvis a torrente Doctorum sacrorum alienus,* aequos se praebeant censores.[28]

This new sense, therefore, must fit the context and must be in harmony with the teaching of Holy Scripture and the doctrine of the Church. It may *be lacking,* however, in the traditional exegesis given by the Fathers. It is very important to note that Cajetan did not say *"contra* torrentem Doctorum" but "a torrente Doctorum sacrorum alienus." Cajetan maintains that there may be found at times a sense in Holy Scripture which the Fathers did not express. He gives clear norms for finding this sense: it must be in harmony with the context, the teaching of Holy Scripture itself, the truth of the Christian faith, and the practice of the Church. What better norms could be established for the finding of a true sense of Sacred Scripture than that it be "apud Sacram Scripturam, apud christianae fidei veritatem, apud Catholicae Ecclesiae documenta et mores"?

It is not very difficult to understand the inferior position assigned to Cajetan in the field of exegesis when we reflect that soon after the publication of his works he was opposed by the powerful and influential Faculty of Theology at Paris, attacked by an outstanding professor of theology in the person of Catharinus, and censured by one of the greatest figures at the Council of Trent, Melchior Cano.

[27] *Ibid.,* p. 8.
[28] Cajetan, *op. cit.,* Praefatio in Genesim, 1.

The Cardinal, however, was not without support even in those early years. One of the greatest lights of the Thomist School, John of St. Thomas († 1644), considered Cajetan's exegesis of sufficient value to call upon his authority in his own *Cursus theologicus in summa theologicam D. Thomae.*[29] John of St. Thomas invokes the authority of Cajetan, not as the Prince of Commentators on the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas, but he invokes his authority precisely as an exegete.

Pallavicini, the historian of the Council of Trent, supports Cajetan against the criticism of Melchior Cano concerning the doctrine of Cajetan on the question of the *novus sensus.* Pallavicini maintains that the position of Cajetan is in nowise contrary to the doctrines proposed by the Fathers at the Council of Trent.[30]

Richard Simon, who is generally credited with being a forerunner of the critical school of exegesis among Catholics, disagrees with the conclusion of the Theological Faculty of Paris that Cajetan was too ignorant of the biblical languages for the task of translating the Scriptures from their original tongues. "The Cardinal," says Simon," did a much better job than many a translator who was more skilled in the languages."[31]

Others, such as Sixtus of Siena[32] supported Cajetan in particular points of controversy, but it was not until toward the end of the last century that the tide seems to have definitely turned in Cajetan's favor. To anyone familiar with the works of Père Lagrange, it is evident that the great leader of modern biblical scholarship held the work of Cardinal Cajetan in high regard. It is interesting to note in passing the striking similarities in the careers of these two exegetes.

Fr. Cornely, in his *Compendium introductionis in libros sacros*[33] does not recommend Cajetan wholeheartedly, nor does he positively disapprove of his work. He does point out that the exegetical

[29] John of St. Thomas, *Cursus theologicus* (Paris, 1885), VI, 574.

[30] Pallavicini, *Istoria del concilio di Trento* (Rome, 1656), I, 1, VI, Cap. 18, p. 582.

[31] Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du vieux testament* (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 316.

[32] Sixtus of Siena, *Bibliotheca sancta* (Lyons, 1593), p. 360.

[33] Fr. R. Cornely, S.J., *Compendium introductionis in libros sacros* (Paris, 1909), p. 165.

works of Cajetan must be examined with caution in many places. It is true that the testimony of Fr. Cornely might be adduced to show an unfavorable opinion towards the Cardinal, but with qualification.

Fr. Vosté, the late Secretary of the Biblical Commission, is enthusiastic in his admiration for the work of Cajetan. While admitting that there are mistakes which a beginner of any new movement will inevitably make, Fr. Vosté considers the work of Cajetan to be a great contribution to the development of the science of exegesis.[34] He is not blind to such extremes of Cajetan as the latter's excessive literalism on occasion, or his neglect of the Fathers. Yet, Fr. Vosté considers the work of the Cardinal monumental, when viewed in the light of modern principles of exegesis. While it is true that the exposition of the text is quite literal, this exposition is never a mere philological treatise such as many moderns of the critical school compose.

The present position of Cajetan's exegetical works is best expressed by the Spanish Dominican, Fr. Alberto Colunga in his article, *El Cardenal Cayetano y los problemos de introduccion biblica*.[35] Fr. Vosté says that this article does credit not only to Cajetan but to its distinguished author as well.[36] Fr. Colunga endeavors to evaluate the work of Cajetan by the same measure used by Fr. Vosté: the principles of modern scholarship and historical equity. He concludes his study of Cajetan's work with these words: "And yet, we must say, that having studied Cajetan's work according to the principles of historical equity, this work should be held as a work of exegetical renovation, sufficient to merit for its author a place among the most praiseworthy men of his age."[37]

THOMAS AQUINAS COLLINS, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

[34] J. M. Vosté, O.P., "Cardinalis Caietanus sacrae scripturae interpres," *Angelicum* (1934), p. 472.

[35] Fr. Alberto Colunga, O.P., "El Cardenal Cayetano y los problemas de introduccion biblica," *La Ciencia Tomista* (1918), p. 22.

[36] Vosté, *op. cit.*, p. 446.

[37] Colunga, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

MLLE. DE SOULFOUR AND THE BISHOP OF GENEVA

To some superficial modern readers, St. Francis de Sales' *Introduction to a Devout Life* seems about as interesting and up-to-date as Charles Fielding's *Hypatia*. They find the allusions obscure, the pseudo-scientific comparisons absurd. It is too bad they stop at these unimportant archaisms and fail to find the wonderfully modern richness of insight and principle that fills the pages. Not for nothing was this father of Modern Devotion made a Doctor of the Church. The sweeping theological foundations that he gave to a more flexible concept of the pursuit of perfection not only are valid today, but need recalling. Priests who are called on to do any real direction of souls can find in his letters of direction a great many theoretical and practical helps.

There is one aspect of his letters of direction that as yet does not seem to have been closely studied: that is their very beginnings in the series of letters that were the Saint's first attempt at real spiritual direction. There are only three letters in the series. They were written in 1603 to a young French nun living in Paris. But these three letters[1] are enough to show not only the varied abilities of the author, but also, and they are the subject of this paper, the main lines of some of the very principles that he will study more profoundly and more extensively in his later writings.

The young nun's name was Mlle. de Soulfour. She was a novice at the Convent of the Daughters of God in Paris.[2] He met her there during his extended diplomatic visit to Paris in 1602.[3]

[1] St. Francis de Sales, *Oeuvres*, Edition Complète, Mackey, O.S.B. (Annecy: J. Nierat, 1902) Tome XII (Lettres Tome II), Letter 174, pp. 163-170; Letter 181, pp. 180-183; Letter 190, pp. 202-206.

[2] This convent had a rather long and varied history. It was started at Paris in 1225 as a refuge for young girls. Gradually it became more of a convent in the ordinary sense. In 1358, during the Hundred Years War, the old building was burnt to the ground. In 1360 the Bishop of Paris gave the homeless nuns a hospital asking only that a part be kept for overnight guests. But by 1453, there were so few nuns left that Rome linked the house with the more prosperous Order of Fontrevault. Things

Mlle. de Soulfour first appears in the Saint's letters as a passing reference in a letter to her father, a member of the Paris parliament and Seigneur de Menouville.[4] The other three letters at issue produce at best a shadowy picture of her personality: sensitive, high strung, tending to worry and introspection, she seems to have been clear-headed enough to take good advice.

The young nun wrote first, apparently asking St. Francis to direct her. The new Bishop[5] writes back very graciously, but hints it would be better if she were directed by someone near at hand. In the second letter he shows a trace of irritation. It seems she had written that she could receive graces from God only through him. He calls this a temptation of the devil, who tries to make us pass by those things that are close at hand, but can really help us, and sigh for those that are far away and will do us little good. In the third letter he explains that he did not want to stop her writing to him, but only hoped that she would lose her overconfidence in him. Since she seems to have been toying with the idea of having no spiritual director but Christ if she couldn't have him, he advises her to pick a definite director.

---

were on the upgrade, however, by the time of these letters. In 1606 the house counted about a hundred nuns.

[3] St. Francis de Sales (1567-1622) was sent to Paris in January 1602 by the then Bishop of Geneva, Msgr. Granier, to plead with King Henry IV that the terms of the *Interim* be carried out in the land of Gex newly given back to the King of France by the Duke of Savoy. His good name as a preacher had gone before him and the Duchess de Longueville asked him to give the Lenten sermons before the Court. King Henry then invited him to speak at Fontainebleau on Quasimodo Sunday. With this start, he was sought on all sides for help and guidance. Among those who did so were the nuns of the Convent of the Daughters of God. Cf. M. Hamon, *Vie de St. François de Sales,* revised by M. Gonthier and M. Letourneau, II volumes (Paris: Gabalda, 1909), Tome I, Bk. III, Ch. IV, pp. 403; 407; 415.

[4] *Oeuvres,* T. XII, Letter 174, pp. 163-170.

[5] When the King finally let the Baron de Lux return to govern Burgundy and Gex, St. Francis' mission was over. Just about that time, he received the Bulls from Rome, signed July 15th, 1602, and sent the 5th of September, naming him Coadjutor Bishop of Geneva with right of succession. The end of his work and his fear for the health of the ailing Msgr. Granier combined to make him hurry home. He planned his consecration for the 3rd of November. The older Bishop died, however, on the 29th of September. Cf. Hamon, *Vie de St. Fr. de Sales,* pp. 426-27; pp. 438 f.

Mlle. de Soulfour's main concern at first was whether or not she ought to accept certain emotions of joy and happiness that she felt in serving God: "You ask me if you ought to receive and relish certain emotions; (you say) that without them you lack courage, and yet you cannot experience them without suspicion and that you think that you ought to reject them."[6] This is the way he expressed the difficulty himself in the first letter. Though she felt the sustaining strength of these feelings, she feared that there was something selfish and self-centered about them. If so, then perhaps it were better to do without them.

St. Francis de Sales handles this very real difficulty of a beginner by giving several rules on how to tell good feelings from bad feelings, and thus, which ought to be accepted, which rejected. These rules differ from those for the Discernment of Spirits in the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius of Loyola only in approach and development.[7]

Those feelings can be understood as coming from the good spirit, he explains, if they are not accepted in themselves, lingered over for the pleasure they might give: "When we do not delay over them, but use them as a source of strength, so that afterwards we can better do our duty and the work God has assigned us, that is a good sign."[8] They are also good if they arouse no thoughts of pride, but rather leave us conscious of our own weaknesses and failings; if they help us to overcome difficulties before us in the service of God. In brief, then, if these feelings are more of a means than an end, they are good; and if they are good, then they are to be accepted gratefully and humbly as God-given helps.

Then, with that shrewdness that will characterize so much of his later direction, the Saint lays bare the root of her trouble. The basic reason why she has been worrying about these little consolations and feelings is that she is in too great a hurry to be perfect.

[6] *Oeuvres*, T. XII, Letter 174, p. 164. The letter is headed, Annecy, Jan. 16, 1603.

[7] Monumenta Ignatiana, *Exercitia Spiritualia Sancti Ignatii de Loyola et Eorum Directoria* (Madrid, Typis Successorum Rivadeneyrae, 1919), Regulae ad Eumdem Effectum cum Majori Discretione Spirituum, et Conducunt Magis pro Secunda Hebd., cf. esp. Reg. Quinta, pp. 530-532.

[8] *Oeuvres*, T. XII, Letter 174, p. 164.

Since the young nun's superior had asked it, he puts his advice on this last matter in the form of three commands. They are phrased very cleverly indeed.

His first command is that she have "a general and all-inclusive will to serve God in the best way you can, and not to start probing and subtly scrutinizing what is the best possible way."[9] He asks her not to examine herself too closely to try to discover how perfect or imperfect she is. For, he says, we will *always* find ourselves imperfect, and when this introspection is done with worry and strain, it can do harm and is a pure waste of time.

His second command is that she simplify her thoughts: "do not think so hard or turn over your mind so much; go forward simply and with confidence."[10] She ought to think only of God and herself, he writes; of His goodness and her misery. It is useless for us to worry about the faults of others, he adds, since the fact that our own imperfections may be different from theirs, does not make them any the less imperfections.

The third command he gives her is that she act towards God in her new life as a child learning to walk acts towards its mother; namely trusting in Him, not worrying about little difficulties, and finding new strength in His arms. "When you see that God is helping you by means of the will and strength to serve Him that He gives you, go ahead with courage; don't be taken aback by a few trips or stumbles; in any case, don't worry about them, as long as from time to time you throw yourself into His arms. . . ."[11]

In the spring of 1603, St. Francis de Sales left his diocese for Piedmont to see the Duke of Savoy. He returned to Annecy for the Feast of Pentecost on the eighteenth of May. Soon after this he wrote the second letter to Mlle. de Soulfour.[12]

In this letter he echoes the thoughts of the first. He had written of her too great haste for perfection as the basic reason for her

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 168.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[12] Hamon, *Vie de St. François de Sales*, p. 479 and note 2. The critical edition of the letter (Letter 181, p. 180), suggests the date April-May, 1603. But since the letter is headed Annecy and St. Francis had left on his trip late in February, it must have been written sometime after his return in May.

trouble. Now he suggests another, intermediate, cause; a great number of desires, "a multitude of desires that will never be fulfilled."[13] From this arises a certain frustration. His sympathetic insight is shown when he adds that these numberless desires spring also from the great thirst created in the beginner's soul by the sweet taste of God's grace.

St. Francis warns that "if you do not begin actually to realize some of these desires, they will keep on increasing and will so confuse your soul you will never see any way out of the problem."[14] Even if she reduces only a very few of these to practice, this will have a soothing, releasing effect on her. Of course the problem then is, which ones? He points out that her desires of charity can easily find scope on the hospital duties that are part of every nun's job at the convent, and that her desires for humility can find outward expression in the innumerable little, obscure tasks about the convent.

"It is fine to wish for many things; but these wishes must be ordered and actually brought to pass, each one at its proper time and according to your own capabilities."[15] The Saint feels that though great desires are good, well-ordered desires are better, and that the least desire that is actually carried out is worth more in the long run than a host that remain unborn.

He shows that he is aware of the fact that kind and good advice does not always bring quick peace to a soul when he says towards the end of the letter that if these thoughts he has suggested do not really help, then she should be patient and strong. "But finally, if you find no relief in these remedies, be patient; wait till the sun rises—it will burn away these mists."[16] At the foot of the Cross she will find both these virtues, he adds, and she should hurry there as often as she feels the need.

St. Francis sounds a note that is expressive both of the solid humility and the superb psychology of the man when he concludes the letter by writing that what he has said to her is not really worth very much in itself, but that he sends it to her hoping that she will see in it at least a sign of the very real interest he has in her welfare.

[13] *Oeuvres*, Letter 181, p. 181.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

In July, the Saint sent his third and final letter. This one implies that the first two have been somewhat effective, for the whole tone presumes that Mlle. de Soulfour has pretty well gotten over her difficulties. That the process is not yet quite complete, however, is shown by the introduction in which he assures her that she should not be surprised that she is not *completely* freed from her worries.

The Bishop tells her that since she has done so well, she ought to try to rest. Thus with her mind at ease, she can look back quietly and see how her desire for absolute perfection spawned that host of desires—such as imaginary perfection—that cannot be put into execution. The important thing is that she have good and realizable desires.

It must be admitted that at this point in the letter he is not quite clear. It would seem he is saying that if she prepares her heart with good desires for the service of God, she will not be able to put all of these into effect either, but this is not the same thing as the multiplicity of desires and the straining of every nerve that comes from too great a haste to reach absolute perfection.

We must take into account our limitations and failings:

> . . . It is necessary in order to travel well to concentrate on the road closest to us; also, while going ahead on the first day, not to be wishing and hoping that it were the last.
>
> Remember this saying: we sometimes try so hard to be good angels that we fail to be good men and women. Our imperfections will be with us to the grave. We cannot travel without touching the earth; we must not lie down and loll about, but neither should we think of flying; for we are still wingless fledglings. We die little by little; our imperfections should die along with us day by day. Dear imperfections which make us conscious of our misery and the necessity of humility and contempt of self, patience and hard work. Despite them all, God looks to the intention of our heart, which is perfect.[17]

The things to strive for are the little virtues, those within our reach, such as "patience, tolerance of others, helpfulness, humility, calm courage, kindness, putting up with our faults and the other small virtues."[18]

[17] *Oeuvres*, T. XII, Letter 190, p. 205. [18] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

If she does this with a holy simplicity, he concludes, trusting in God's goodness, not worrying about hidden dangers, she will live in great peace and reach success.

The letter ends on a note that probably explains why it is the last: "Pray for me and my crushing labors."[19]

Did the young nun remain in the convent? Perhaps she did, perhaps she did not,[20] but in any case, the advice she received was as solid and stimulating as any she could have hoped for.

In these letters, then, St. Francis de Sales describes both a state of soul and the solutions to the problems of that state.

The state of soul is that of a person entering the path of the counsels. Having just left the dark wood[21] of a world full of confusion, turmoil, pettiness and sinfulness, this person finds himself faced with the bright ideal of Godliness. He feels his mind flooded with clear light, his will with sweet strength and his heart with new warmth. Having learned a few principles of this new life such as prayer and self-denial, as well as the necessity of such virtues as humility and patience, he sees them as ideals to be reached as quickly as possible. In his inexperience he feels that if he wills it hard enough he can reach the heights of these ideals in no time at all. Daily experience disproves this. He becomes confused, thinks something is wrong with the way he is wanting or willing. He multiplies his wishes and attempts. Result: more failures; more confusion. Unless helped at this point, a fierce

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

[20] The editors of the critical edition believe that Mlle. de Soulfour did not persevere (T. XII, Letter 174, note 1, p. 163) and this for two reasons: 1. the death list of the monastery does not list her though it does her aunt and companion; 2. in the second letter to Monsieur de Soulfour, St. Francis says "your daughter, whose care my spirit cannot abandon 'quoy qu'inutile'" (T. XII, Letter 187, p. 198). Their first reason could be explained in other ways. By itself it is only indicative. The second reason is inconclusive; "quoy qu'inutile" can mean "though useless," but it can also mean "though there be no need." The implication of this second is totally different. This last interpretation would seem to be supported by the fact that the third letter to the nun was written after this. In any case, the evidence is too sparse to warrant definite conclusions.

[21] Dante's term. He says of it in Canto I of the Inferno, "Oh how hard a thing it is to tell what a wild and rough and stubborn wood this was, which in my thoughts renews the fear." *Divine Comedy*, Carlyle-Wicksteed Translation (New York: Modern Library, 1950).

inner turmoil can begin which can destroy his new found peace. In some it will cause such discouragement that they will decide the life of perfection is really not for them anyhow.

All this is a not uncommon experience. St. Francis de Sales lays down clearly the lines of solution. Instead of setting up an absolute and specific goal, he advises this person just starting the life of perfection, to be content with a general resolution of serving God as best he can. Instead of worrying about himself and his little faults, he ought to think of God, His greatness and goodness. If he acts as a child and trusts in Him, God will teach him what he needs to know. Instead of hatching spiritual day-dreams, he should practice the virtues near at hand, hidden in those ordinary, workaday jobs that are part of the daily round. The least wish that he actually realizes in practice is better than thousands of others that remain mere wishes. He should be what he is, a beginner. If he remains simple, he will not think it possible to o'erleap all the middle stages in the daily buildup of virtue. Otherwise he will fail to be both a good angel and a good man.

For a first series of letters of direction, then, it can be said that St. Francis de Sales shows good psychological and theological insight. Most of these ideas will be repeated and developed, along with many others, in later letters and works, but it is always a fascinating experience to encounter important ideas in their germinal form.

RICHARD W. ROUSSEAU, S.J.

Louvain, Belgium

THE CHRISTIAN RATIONAL BASIS FOR WORLD ORDER

The most recent annual meeting of the cardinals, archbishops and bishops of the U. S., held at The Catholic University of America in Washington, produced a forceful statement titled "Religion, Our Most Vital National Asset." The document is sweeping in its ambit. Touching on the root ills of much of our contemporary society, it cogently points the way to a sovereign remedy: the orientation of human life in terms of man's relationship to God. "Without religion," the American hierarchy declared, "this life, with its disappointments, its uncertainties, its cruelty, and its suffering, becomes 'but a walking shadow, a poor player that struts and frets his hour upon the stage and then is heard no more . . . a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.'"

Applying this basic truth to the realm of national and international civic society, the assembled bishops reminded all that "men are indeed forced by the conditions of human nature to unite and co-operate in the fulfillment of their common needs. But union and co-operation can continue to exist among free men only when justice and charity, universal in their binding force because imposed by God Himself, are embodied in law."

By a singular coincidence, at the very moment our bishops were preparing their notable statement, Archbishop Angelo Roncalli, Apostolic Nuncio to France, delivered the sermon at the Mass marking the opening in Paris of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The Archbishop, official observer for the Holy See at the meeting, pointed out that the Church is anxious to promote the worthy ends of UNESCO: international amity and mutual cultural aid towards a balanced world social order. He also urged Catholics to cooperate with the organization (which Russia has repeatedly boycotted) in all its Christian objectives. Taking up the thread of a previous instruction of the Holy Father, Archbishop Roncalli stressed once more that the high ideals of the organization could be realized only if its operations are informed by the dictates of justice and charity.

Since this same emphasis constantly appears in the statements of the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries, it is obviously important and timely to examine briefly the Church's mind on the function of justice and charity in the establishment of international social order. We all know how nebulous such concepts as "justice" and "charity" can be unless pinned down to concrete notions. "Words," so goes the Jewish proverb, "should be weighed, not counted."

THE PATTERN OF PEACE

The U. N. is quite evidently the only body striving on a vast scale today to effect a mutual understanding among the world's states. And there is a deal of cynicism over the success of the U. N. and all its works and pomps. Even among some Catholics one finds, unfortunately, a tendency to minimize the necessity of such an organization, to belittle its real achievements and to stand aghast when confronted by its all too human foibles. However far short of the ideal the organization may fall, still the fact remains that the machinery the world needs is there. The temptation to condemn the U. N. out of hand is scarcely consonant with the wise advice of Pope Pius XII that all men of good will must work together for the achievement of its purposes. The truth is, of course, that the skeletal structure must be enlivened with the solid flesh and blood and living spirit of Christian justice and charity. And who can better communicate these than we Catholics, enlightened by divine truth and led on by the dynamics of Catholic Action?

Our age, so long caught up in the vortex of titanic conflicts, both military and ideological, needs desperately to be reminded that only friendship and fairness can weave the pattern for peaceful human society. The friendship of charity and the fairness of justice are the two indispensable components of a tranquil order among nations, as they are of serene domestic society. "Unless religion with its binding force in justice and charity supplies the foundation of law and authority," our American bishops observed in the recent statement from Washington, "there remains only human convention or brute force as the unifying element in society."

By whatever route he may pursue it, and however so stupidly or wisely he may plan to capture it, the profound truth is that man's destiny includes the quest for order. Thus the institutions of diplomacy, as well as the violent force of war (that most extreme

of diplomatic maneuvers), are all aimed at deriving a coherent unity from the countlessly varied and conflicting elements of man's social existence. This perennial pursuit is indeed connatural to man since, as intelligent, he is able to apprehend the essential unity of being. And so our world, and the lives and needs of other men are intelligible to us in the measure that they share this oneness. Hence it is that *order,* the intelligent union of individual components, is wise and good and desirable, and men accordingly yearn to inform human relationships with such principles of order as will guarantee unity.

While order *as such* is good and desirable, it may well be that a particular, concrete order is anything but good and wise. That a plan of order may be false or even intentionally malign is undeniable, and the quality of the principles of a social order determine the character of a society.

Man's awareness—at least— implicit—of the causal relation between principles and a resultant order has compelled him to evolve concepts by which he may design national and international life. Into what labyrinthine ways of chaos and misery perverted principles have drawn societies is amply shown by philosophers of history. Christopher Dawson has convincingly described the cult of individual egotism and social militarism as merely the consequence of applying to social life an evolutionary theory that explains man's development in terms of the mechanical operation of blind forces ruling the material world.[1]

It is in this context of principles that justice and charity enter the *mise en scène.* Authentic Catholic teaching insistently proclaims that solely genuine justice, tempered by charity, can secure to mankind a due fulness of temporal benefits. Pope Pius XII developed this thought in the unforgettable Christmas message of 1939. At the very outset of World War II, the Holy Father urged the peoples of the world and their governments to employ these principles to produce that sense of deep and keen responsibility needed to weigh human plans according to the sacred and inviolable standards of God's law.[2]

[1] Cf. *Progress and Religion* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1934), pp. 19-20.

[2] *AAS*, 32 (1940), 5-13.

The present Supreme Pontiff delivered eleven major public pronouncements between his election to the papacy in March, 1939, and the outbreak of war, six months later. In each of these he stressed above all else the vital need for charity and justice as the basis for order in human agreements. As had his saintly predecessor, Leo XIII (particularly in his encyclical *Immortale Dei*, on the Christian constitution of states), Pius XII insisted that without direct reference to religion and the solidarity of all mankind in the unity of charity, any attempt to group nations in mutual harmony would be doomed to failure.

In a similar vein, the Bishops at The Catholic University last November declared that if human institutions are divorced from religion's justice and charity, there will ever be wanting that sense of responsibility which alone prevents human existence from becoming a wilderness of warring passions and aimless strivings. Without the hope this concept offers, we cannot rise above that pessimism, that sense of despair, which threaten to engulf the whole of our civilization.

THE ROLE OF THE TWO VIRTUES

Without the implementation of the exigencies of justice and charity, any appeal by international organizations to a code of peace will remain fruitless. The barely used "meditation room" in the General Assembly building of the U.N., for all its white flowers and 300-year-old agba wood log from French Equatorial Africa, is so much wasted space if a secularist mentality constructs a false sense of human autonomy *vis-à-vis* divine rights.

Under the aegis of that booby-trap autonomy, the splendid virtue of charity becomes little more than a vague expediency of benevolence, resting precariously on the razor's edge of national self-interest. And honorable justice becomes a poor relation, a creature of mere convention, standing uneasily upon the shifting sands of unpredictable caprice. *Mirabile dictu* that a building with so many windows as the U.N.'s should afford entrance to so little light.

Even pagan thinkers, although unacquainted with divine revelation, perceived clearly the primordial place of justice and charity in the establishment of abiding social harmony. Aristotle taught that injustice undermines the very supports of all communal life.

degrades men and spawns strife and chaos, while justice, on the other hand, helps to produce concord and genuine fraternal love.[3] In the absence of justice, an equality or proportion inclining men and nations to mutual affection cannot be attained. In the mind of Aristotle, justice does not itself *constitute* the social bond uniting men; that is the function of friendship availing itself of the equality fostered by justice.[4]

St. Thomas Aquinas developed substantially the same doctrine when he wrote that peace, the tranquility of order, is the work of justice indirectly, in the sense that justice removes impediments to order. But the *ordinata concordia* itself, the essence of true peace, is directly the effect of charity, which alone has the force of unitive love: *amor est vis unitiva.*[5]

The solidarity of all human society requires such a full observance of social justice as will satisfy the demands of the common good of national and international life. Without it there can be no sound organic structure among nations. But above and beyond the need for justice there must be charity: the cohesive and unifying force of which is alone capable of vitalizing and perfecting the impersonal quality of justice.

The inability of justice alone to give rise to a firm social order, and the corresponding need of its being transfused with charity, was sharply underscored by Pius XI in *Quadragesimo anno:*

> Justice by itself, although most diligently practiced, while it can indeed take away the causes of social strife, still cannot produce unity of hearts and minds. And yet this union, binding men together, is the chief principle of stability in all institutions which intend to establish social peace and to promote mutual aid, and in the absence of this union, the wisest provisions remain ineffectual.[6]

THE MIASMA OF GODLESS CHARITY

Among nations, as among individuals, real charity cannot subsist when God's supreme role in the triangle of affection is denied or ignored. Author and Final Cause of all, God is precisely the

[3] Cf. *Nichomachean Ethics* (New York: Random House, 1941), Bk. 8, 1160.

[4] Cf. *Politics* (*ed. ibid.*), Bk. 3, c. 12, 1282.

[5] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 29, a. 3, ad 3.

[6] *AAS*, 23 (1931), 223.

reason why men must love one another, reverencing God's likeness in the human person. And without charity there can be no genuine justice, for only charity can induce men to make freely the surrender of self-interest in the wider interests of justice.

Coercion may compel one to perform acts that mimic the mandates of justice, but separated from the vital influence of charity, these actions will continue only as long as the compulsion that causes them. In the proper sense of the word, order cannot flourish in a police society. Without freedom man ceases to be man.

The monstrosity of godless charity—a repudiation of the order of love—has begotten the absurdities of "individualism" and "collectivist-humanitarianism." In the view of myopic individualism, each element of society is seen as its own ultimate end. With equal blindness, humanitarianism attempts to make man's temporal good the total aim of social organization.

By a paradox as inevitable as it is tragic, collectivist-humanitarianism is carried finally to a denial of the individual's dignity and liberty, simply because it disavows the significance of the person in an essentially impersonal society. "If today Christianity stands for freedom," the bishops stated in November, "it is because Christianity is truth."

Does it follow then that no balanced international order can be achieved unless and until all peoples have become thoroughly Christian in law, in philosophy and in religion? If that were so then assuredly any hope of *ordinata concordia* would be tenuous in the extreme. Rather it is a fact that the Church's social teaching includes the natural law, the loyal observance of which by the agencies of international society would provide a basis of some value for the restoration of order.

"The human soul is naturally Christian" is not merely one of the wisest of observations; it is also a formula for the salvation of contemporary society. In the encyclical *Caritate Christi compulsi*, on the troubles of our times, Pius XI warned the world that to create the atmosphere of lasting peace, neither treaties nor the most solemn pacts, nor international efforts of statesmen will suffice, unless in the first place are recognized the sacred rights of natural and divine law.[7] Have not the bitterness and disillusion-

[7] Cf. *AAS*, 24 (1932), 177-94.

ment and consuming sense of universal frustration of our brave new world fully vindicated the prophetic (and ignored) truth of the Pope's words?

Man's world may never be individualistic, for that atomizes society. Nor may it be collectivistic, for that regards community life as a mere heap of individuals devoid of true unity. Human existence must rather be corporate. There is no antithesis between the inherent natural rights of the person and the communicated rights of natural, personalized society. The individual and his social milieu; a nation and its sister-nations, these groups are—by divine intent—complementary, all controlled and directed to their respective ends by reciprocal liabilities and prerogatives.

Even as citizens use the state as a highly perfected instrument to obtain temporal benefits, so states in turn use international society and should thereby produce international good. That is the ideal and a condition prerequisite to good order.

> Every constant factor, which brings any two nations into touch with one another, establishes a positive society between them. This society is subject to the universal laws of justice and love, for these nations are equals and are destined to the same end. . . . Thus it is *nature itself,* that eloquent interpreter of the divine will, which calls all peoples to form among themselves *one universal association,* and at the same time makes it their duty to do so.[8]

Only nations that manifest a sincere good will to embrace this doctrine, and publicly (and without quibble) subscribe to it, deserve membership in any effective world society. International order can be established and promoted only by states that demonstrate, in a practical manner, their readiness to put up this minimum moral subscription as the price for a place in the community of nations.

Ultimately, there can be no world community at all, with a written charter to guarantee it, unless the system finally evolved correlates legal rights of states with their fulfillment of moral obligations. What our bishops recently declared with regard to the more limited obligations of our individual American states can be urged

[8] A. C. F. Beales, *The Catholic Church and International Order* (Middlesex, Eng.: Penguin Books, 1941), p. 152.

with equal cogency with regard to international society: "In its internal and external affairs the State will uphold, and it will expect its citizens and its officials to uphold, that standard of morality which flows necessarily from belief in God and in God's law."

The inescapable alternative to this course is unending strife and hopeless anarchy on a global scale. Article I of the U.N. Charter requires that assembly "to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedom." The November statement of the American bishops has once again reminded men that there can be no ersatz claimants to the thrones of justice and charity in a free world.

AIDAN CARR, O.F.M.CONV.

Saint Anthony-on-Hudson
Rensselaer, N. Y.

A PROPHETIC CALL TO PRAYER

Pray then, Venerable Brethren, pray without ceasing; pray especially when you offer the Divine Sacrifice of Love. Do you, too, pray, you whose courageous profession of the faith entails today hard, painful, and, not rarely, heroic sacrifices; pray you, suffering and agonizing members of the Church, when Jesus comes to console and to heal your pains, and do not forget, with a true spirit of mortification and worthy practice of penance to make your prayers more acceptable in the eyes of Him who "lifteth up all that fall: and setteth up all that are cast down" (*Ps.* 144:14), that He in His mercy may shorten the days of trial and that thus the words of the Psalmist may be verified: "Then they cried out to the Lord in their affliction: and he delivered them out of their distresses" (*Ps.* 106:13).

And you, white legions of children who are so loved and dear to Jesus, when you receive in Holy Communion the Bread of Life, raise up your simple and innocent prayers and unite them with those of the Universal Church. The Heart of Jesus, who loves you, does not resist your suppliant innocence. Pray every one, pray uninterruptedly: "Pray without ceasing" (I *Thes.*, 5:17).

—Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical *Summi pontificatus*, issued Oct. 20, 1939.

OUR LADY OF FATIMA AND THE SCAPULAR

There no longer can be any question about the facts of our Blessed Mother's appearances at Fatima in 1917. The requests she made there are being spread every day further throughout the world and in ever increasing multitudes Catholics are responding. Preachers, writers, artists, organizers and teachers are zealously broadcasting the message of Fatima and now even Hollywood is adding its voice. Theologians have put a firm doctrinal basis beneath the devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the stage is now set for the consecration of reparation so urgently asked by Our Lady in 1925 and again in 1929.

However, it is of serious concern that part of the Fatima message is being somewhat overlooked by many of its ardent proponents. A recent survey of Catholic magazines showed only rare instances where the Fatima requests were properly enumerated. Certainly when we are trying so anxiously to please Our Lord and His Blessed Mother we want to answer their plea as faithfully as we can.

During the great miracle of the sun on Oct. 13, 1917, three tableaux were enacted in the heavens: the Holy Family, Our Lady of Sorrows, and Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Many authors questioned this, so the Prior General of the Carmelites, the Most Rev. Kilian Lynch, O.Carm., asked Fr. Aloysius Gonzaga de Oliveira, O.Carm., to investigate the matter. Father Aloysius is custodian of the church in Lisbon (sixty miles from Fatima) where Portugal's national hero, the Carmelite laybrother Blessed Nuno, is buried.

Father Aloysius first contacted Rev. Dr. Manuel Nunez Formigao, one-time rector of the Theological Seminary of Braganoca and one of the official diocesan investigators appointed by the bishop of Leiria (in which territory Fatima is located), to inquire into all the facts about Fatima. Dr. Formigao's answer is summarized thus: "He said that there was no doubt about it. Having seen the seer [Lucy], who said that Our Lady of Mount Carmel had appeared, he then asked how she knew it was Our Lady of Mount Carmel; her answer was 'because she looked like the picture that could be seen at the parish church of Fatima.'" Father Alo-

ysius describes this picture: "It represents Our Lady with the Carmelite habit, holding the Infant Jesus, each having a Scapular in the right hand, and below, the Purgatory, from whose flames angels are seen taking off souls."[1]

Lucy's own letter, dated Aug. 27, 1946, has this to say: "It may very well be that I might have told Dr. Formigao that Our Lady looked like the picture that is venerated at the parish church of Fatima, because in the changes of light that occurred, Our Lady took various aspects and her dress various colors, which gave us an idea more or less of Our Lady of Dolors and of Carmel, since she had already told us that in the last month (October) Our Lady of Dolors and of Carmel would come;[2] hence our absolute certainty that Our Lady was appearing to us under these different aspects."[3]

On Aug. 15, 1950, another Carmelite from Chicago, Fr. Howard Rafferty, O.Carm., Provincial Director of the Third Order, obtained an hour and a half interview with Lucy, now a Carmelite nun, Sister Mary of the Immaculate Heart.[4] He summarizes her answers thus:

When I asked her if Our Lady of Mount Carmel had appeared at Fatima, she answered: "Yes, certainly!" Then I asked her about the

---

[1] Rev. Howard Rafferty, O.Carm., "The Tertiary and the Fatima Crusade," *Carmel's Call* (Chicago: The Carmelite Press, 1948), p. 100. Dr. Formigao's eminence is noted by William Thomas Walsh, *Our Lady of Fatima* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), pp. 130-38, 155, 177, and others.

[2] Lucy *Memoir* 4, 41, quoted by Walsh, *op. cit.*, p. 130: "Meanwhile the Lady had revealed herself to the three children, and Lucia and Jacinta had heard her lovely voice in the briefest of all their conversations. 'Continue to say the Rosary,' she said, 'to bring about the end of the war. In October Our Lord will come also, and Our Lady of the Sorrows of Carmel [*sic*], and Saint Joseph with the Child Jesus, to bless the world . . .'" (Sept. 13, 1917).

[3] Photographic copy of the letter, quoted by Rafferty, *op. cit.*, p. 100, pictured in *Lo Scapolare* (Rome: Vatican Press, 1950), p. 217.

[4] In April, 1948, Lucy, known in the Sisters of St. Dorothy since 1925 as Sister Mary of the Sorrows, became a Carmelite nun at Coimbra with the name of Sister Mary of the Immaculate Heart. "The Blessed Virgin appeared only to Lucy under the aspects of Our Lady of Sorrows and Our Lady of Mount Carmel on October 13, 1917. Perhaps these visions pointed out for her the two phases of her religious vocation" (Thomas McGlynn, O.P., *Vision of Fatima* [Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1948], p. 215).

Scapular and the Message of Fatima: "In many books written about Fatima the authors do not give the Scapular as a necessary part of the Message." Lucy said immediately: "Oh, they are wrong; Our Lady wants all to wear the Scapular." Thinking that this was, perhaps, not too clear, I said: "But Our Lady did not say anything when she appeared as Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Can we be sure she meant by her appearance dressed as Our Lady of Carmel and holding the Scapular that she wanted the Scapular as part of the Message?" Lucy answered: "Yes." And she added: "Now the Holy Father has already told this to the whole world, saying that the Scapular is a sign of Consecration to the Immaculate Heart. Nobody can disagree now." To make the point even clearer I asked: "In giving the conditions of the Fatima Message, is it correct to say that the Scapular is one of the conditions?" Lucy answered: "Yes, certainly." Then I asked: "Is the wearing of the Scapular as important as the saying of the daily Rosary?" Lucy answered: "Yes, the Rosary and the Scapular are inseparable!"[5]

There should never have been the slightest doubt about the final apparitions. On May 13, 1931, all the bishops of Portugal had recited the following prayer at Fatima:

Lady of the Rosary, whose Heart is a filial image of the Heart of thy Divine Son; Lady of Sorrow, whose Heart was pierced by a sword of grief and shared all the sufferings of thy Son; Lady of Mount Carmel, whose maternal Heart does not forget the least of your children, and earnestly desires to reunite them all in Paradise, the shepherds who are anointed and official representatives of their flocks come today solemnly to consecrate the Portuguese Nation to thy Immaculate Heart.[6]

And now, as it were, to put the final touch to the evidence, Pope Pius XII in his letter commemorating the seventh centenary of the giving of the Scapular to St. Simon Stock on July 16, 1251, wrote:

The Holy Scapular, which may be called the Habit or Garment of Mary, is a sign and a pledge of the protection of the Mother of God.... May all see in this Keepsake of the Virgin a concise lesson in modesty and simplicity; above all may Scapular-wearers behold in this same Garment, which they wear day and night, the eloquently expressive

[5] Rev. Howard Rafferty, O.Carm., *Fatima and the Scapular* (Chicago: Carmelite Third Order Press, 1950), pp. 14-15.

[6] Quoted by Rafferty, *Fatima and the Scapular*, p. 1.

symbol of their prayers for the divine assistance; finally may it be to them a Sign of their Consecration to the Most Sacred Heart of the Immaculate Virgin, which [Consecration] in recent times we have so strongly recommended.[7]

This, then, is our proof that the wearing of the Scapular is an integral part of the requests of Our Lady of Fatima, together with the daily Rosary, sacrifices for sinners, and the Communion of Reparation with a quarter hour of mental prayer on the first Saturday of five consecutive months. All of these are part of the devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the Scapular is the sign of the consecration involved in that devotion.

Naturally, Carmel has been honored in Our Lady's once more calling the attention of the world to the Brown Scapular but there is now the additional obligation of love to arouse greater zeal in spreading the devotion. By her original promise Mary had offered the grace of a happy death to those who die wearing the Scapular and by the Sabbatine Privilege she offered release from Purgatory on the first Saturday after death.[8] Now we are told how the Scapular is the external sign of that interior consecration to her Immaculate Heart which is the special practice she requested in 1925 and again in 1929, and, it is said, several times recently.

There is a further consideration of practical value to be found in the Fatima apparition of the Scapular Virgin. The three aspects of the final vision have been interpreted as representations of the Joyful, Sorrowful, and Glorious Mysteries of the Rosary. Archbishop Ryan writes:

Finally, Our Lady showed herself as Our Lady of Mount Carmel. Carmel, as everybody knows, stands for the ideal of contemplative union with God, imperfect on earth but consummate in the light of glory, whither Jesus has ascended and Mary has been assumed. These are things proposed to us in the Glorious Mysteries of the Holy Rosary.[9]

---

[7] Feb. 11, 1950. *Vinculum Ordinis Carmelitarum*, 2 (March, 1950), 41 f.

[8] Rev. Bartholomaeus F. M. Xiberta, O.Carm., *De visione Sancti Simonis Stock* (Rome, 1950), p. 334. A monumental historical treatise. The main conclusions have been summarized in *Take This Scapular!* (Chicago: Carmelite Third Order Press, 1949), pp. 213-43.

[9] Most Rev. Finbar Ryan, O.P., *Our Lady of Fatima* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1944), p. 118.

Through the Carmelite Third Order and likewise through the Scapular Confraternity every Catholic—priest, religious, and lay person—is invited to become a member or an associate of the Carmelite Order, to share its privileges and indulgences but above all to help to put into practice the perfect fulfillment of devotion to Mary and her other requests at Fatima and to Sister Lucy since then.

It is important, therefore, for those interested in growing in devotion to Mary, in spreading that devotion, and in circulating the message of Fatima, to give the Scapular its rightful place. Preachers and writers particularly could with great profit delve into Carmelite Marian literature to study the higher degrees of the spiritual life to be achieved through mystical union with Mary.[10]

NORMAN G. WERLING, O.CARM.

Chicago, Ill.

[10] *Carmelite Directory of the Spiritual Life* (Chicago: Carmelite Press, 1951). Eng. Tr., p. 575. With an excellent bibliography. Ven. Michael of St. Augustine, O.Carm., has written a fine explanation of *The Mariform and Marian Life in Mary and for Mary* that antedates by some thirty years the famous *True Devotion* by St. Louis de Montfort. As a college student at Rennes, France, de Montfort daily made his mental prayer at the Carmelite church and there it was made known to him that God was calling him to the ecclesiastical state (cf. *Take this Scapular*, p. 101).

A GOOD FRIDAY MEDITATION ON THE WAY OF THE CROSS

Ashamed of ourselves, and of the human race, we have come to the foot of the Cross, to make a terribly sobering and enduring act of contrition. That overwhelming act of contrition will never be within our grasp, unless we gaze with rapt attention on Him whom we treated so infamously. Indeed, we shall end the day disappointed, unless we have been able, with the eyes illumined by Faith, to gaze on our suffering Christ, and see Him as our fellowman, bearing our iniquities. Good Friday will be fruitful to us, and consoling to our suffering Saviour, only in proportion as we become participants in Calvary, and only as our contrition becomes like that of Peter and Magdalen.

The key to this overwhelming act of contrition can be found in one of the most haunting phrases of all the liturgy of Holy Week, in which the sorrowing voice of the dead Redeemer comes to us, over and over again: "Christ for us became obedient unto death, even to death on a cross" (*Phil.* 2:8). A sinner is a rebel. The greater his sins are, the more offensive to God has been his rebellion. The longer his habits of sin go on, the more hardened he becomes in his insubordination. All sin is but the refusal to acknowledge or to obey the law of God.

Because he refused to acknowledge God's supreme dominion over him, Lucifer, the leader of the rebellious angels, fell like lightning from heaven. Adam and Eve broke the solemn command of God and ate the forbidden fruit, and for their disobedience they were flung from the Garden of Paradise. Lot's wife, fleeing Sodom, was told not to look back at the city that God was destroying for its wickedness—she disobeyed, looked back, and was turned into a pillar of salt.

Six hundred years before Christ, Jeremias the prophet wrote: "Know thou and see that it is an evil and a bitter thing for thee to have left the Lord thy God, and that my fear is not with thee, saith the Lord, the God of Hosts. Of old thou hast broken my yoke, thou hast burst my hands, and thou saidst: I will not serve" (*Jer.* 2:20).

In a frenzy of revolt, in derision of their God, the executors of the Son of God wrote an inscription which they jeeringly fastened to the mast of the cross of their Master: "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," after they had put on His Head a crown of thorns, and had given Him a reed for a sceptre, in mockery.

"Christ became obedient unto death, even to the death of the Cross." Tell Him to be your Teacher today, and ask Him to explain to your secret heart the lesson of this obedience, and He will explain it more with deeds than with discourse. The words we shall endeavor to supply, as we read the drama of Calvary.

"I became obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross." I was made *obedient* when I became Man, because man is a creature made to know, to love, and to *serve* God in this world. I became obedient *unto the death of the cross,* because man had abused his freedom, defied his God, arrogated unto himself the rights that belonged only to God, and had rendered his whole race a thing abhorrent to his God. In Me today, human flesh again is rendered supremely obedient to its Maker. In Me today, rebellious and defiant human nature was redeemed by My obedient surrender of all abused human affections. One extreme is cancelled by its opposite. Because you abused your talents by withdrawing them from the service of God, I have been obedient unto annihilation.

I have no rancor, no reproof, no accusation; only hope and affection for you. But lest you fail to see what has been done for you this day, lest you heedlessly cast away the blessings so dearly bought for you, not knowing what you do, I only ask that you come with Me by yourself, and as you and I tread together the way of My passion, I shall tell you how I, your God, restored the disorder caused in Heaven by your deliberate sins, by your gone and repented robbery of the obedience due your God.

FIRST STATION: JESUS IS CONDEMNED TO DEATH

As we stand here on the marble steps of Pontius Pilate's palace, I am thinking of your rebellion against the lawful superiors and rulers to whom My Father has given authority over you. I see you disregarding the just commands of your parents, your employers, your Church, your civil rulers, and your God. You would not surrender to just authority in a small matter: I am therefore

offering My life, in obedience to the most unjust sentence ever passed by an unjust judge. I open not My mouth to hinder Pilate's cowardly deed, because you have often secretly evaded the just precepts of some other Pilate.

SECOND STATION: JESUS RECEIVES THE CROSS

You have complained bitterly when My Father in Heaven gave you your burden in life, when He sent you suffering, and privation, when He gave you hard work to do, when He sent you children to care for, and invalids to nurse, and sent you illness and sorrow. Oh yes, many times have I heard you giving vent to your impatience and anger at the hardships that My Father has decreed for you, and I have seen you sulking with smouldering resentment against the decrees of God. But like a lamb led forth to the slaughter, I have bared My back to the lash, and have bowed My head for the crown of thorns, and now I am bracing My shoulder for the crushing cross. My obedience decrees that I carry the cross that you refused to accept from My Father.

THIRD STATION: JESUS FALLS THE FIRST TIME

My Father directed you to think of Him and to pray to Him. With withering indifference, you turned over in bed on Sunday morning, and missed Mass. You have let days go by without a prayer. You walk coldly, thoughtlessly, past the open church, daily, even hourly: and you never step inside to whisper a word of greeting to the Blessed Sacrament. You do not receive Holy Communion, except at rare intervals, a few times a year. By this frigid indifference you have chilled My already broken heart, and I fall under the discouraging wintry blast that shakes My spirit.

FOURTH STATION: JESUS MEETS HIS AFFLICTED MOTHER

You have let your human companions lead you into sin; perhaps you have convinced someone dear to you to be your reluctant partner in grievous sin—possibly not only once, but many times. You have brought scandal to My little ones by your words and deeds. In the place of the sinful human companion with whom you fled from the pure face of God, I surrender the anguished heart and soul of My own immaculate Mother, when her glance meets mine on the way to Calvary.

FIFTH STATION: SIMON OF CYRENE IS COMPELLED TO CARRY THE CROSS

I have made you your brother's keeper, but like Cain of old, you have disclaimed any obligation in charity for those who need your assistance. You have hoarded your wordly goods when others were deprived of necessities. You have habitually passed up opportunities to do a kind deed for your fellow employees, or your wife, or your brother. My Father and yours gave you an obligation in charity to help His other children. If you had fulfilled that obligation obediently, a stranger would not have had to be compelled by the soldiers to help Me with My cross: you would have volunteered.

SIXTH STATION: VERONICA WIPES THE FACE OF JESUS

You have inordinately gloried in the comely features that God gave you; and your vanity has drawn you to admire yourself at the expense of the worship of Him to whose image and likeness you have been created. Because the very beauty that God gave you has scandalized you into invading the rights of God to your undivided service, I have willingly deprived Myself of My divine features as an atoning sacrifice, so that Veronica, in impetuous grief, tried to wipe away their disfigurement.

SEVENTH STATION: JESUS FALLS THE SECOND TIME

As I wearily trudge along the way to Calvary, I am buoyed up by the thought of the honest penitents who are sharing my crucifixion with Me, and who are resolving, here and now, to begin anew the humble service of My Father. But no amount of encouragement can blot out the petulant complaints, the grumbling, the incessant bickerings, that deface the service you should show to the Father, and in sorrow that even this Way of the Cross has not broken down your reluctant heart, I fall a second time, and struggle again to My swollen feet.

EIGHTH STATION: JESUS COMFORTS THE WOMEN OF JERUSALEM

Why are you so blind as not to see that your very tears of sympathy are meaningless, because they are not the tears of a penitent, but of a casual spectator? If you are a thoughtful Christian, you will realize that a mere sentimental sympathy for My sufferings—

a sympathy that costs you nothing—is a very hollow and futile thing. In sorrow, I address to you the same rebuke I offered to the women of Jerusalem: "Weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves and your children."

NINTH STATION: JESUS FALLS THE THIRD TIME

As you reach a helping hand to assist Me to My feet as I fall again and again under the cross, can you not see what My eyes would speak to you? Can you not see that your cowardice or presumption or indifference has led you back again and again into the same old sin—that I surrender my very courage to atone for the frailty of the will you have weakened by habits of sin?

TENTH STATION: JESUS IS STRIPPED OF HIS GARMENTS

Your purity of mind and body was given to you by My Father, to serve a holy purpose. Your betrayal of that chastity by thought, by word, or by deed has left behind an unclean sore that disfigured the image of God in which you have been modeled. To make humble again that proud flesh, I have done violence to My very being, and have surrendered My very sense of shame, and permitted the scurrilous soldiers to strip from Me My garments before the jeering mob. By this the human race can again acknowledge in Me the obedience of its passions to the will of the God who created them.

ELEVENTH STATION: JESUS IS NAILED TO THE CROSS

And these nails, which you see breaking through my writhing, but uncomplaining, hands and feet! Ah, you saw me freely stretch out My own limbs, helping the executioners, not resisting them. When your feet carry you away from your God to a place of sin, when your hands are raised in rebellion to hurt your neighbor, or to seize his goods, every furtive step, every clenched fist, every avaricious clasp is another stroke on the nails that pierce My outstretched hands and feet.

TWELFTH STATION: AFTER THREE HOURS AGONY, JESUS DIES ON THE CROSS

As I now look down upon you from My bed of torture, this cross, I beg you to look with sorrow upon the story of your in-

fidelity, and upon the havoc you have caused; then to raise your eyes to Me who, by My obedience even to the death of the cross, have resurrected you out of those smouldering ruins, to look with new hope and bravery to the task I have died to initiate. I pledge you My promise to arise again, and to work with you from this day forward, for the accomplishment of that glorious task: the honor and glory of our heavenly Father, and the sanctification of your soul.

THIRTEENTH STATION: JESUS IS TAKEN DOWN FROM THE CROSS AND LAID IN THE ARMS OF HIS SORROWFUL MOTHER

It is finished. Now we can gaze with grief on the fruits of our revolt. Christ is taken down from the Cross, and laid in the arms of His stricken Mother. As prodigal children, we stand off, sorrowing that we have been so unworthy, full of remorse that we have done such a deed, our hearts bursting with misery for every pang we have added to the Passion, and ashamed to come closer to let our contrition rush forth in an uncontrolled torrent at the feet of Mary—until she silently reaches out her arm, and draws us to herself.

FOURTEENTH STATION: JESUS IS LAID IN THE TOMB

Let us go down from the tomb to our homes chastened and repentant. Repentance is not complete without a firm determination of amendment. In all humility, let us listen to the words of the Prophet Jeremias: "Return, you rebellious children, and I will heal your rebellions" . . . and let us eagerly answer in the words of the same Prophet: "Behold, we come to thee, for thou art the Lord our God" (*Jer.* 3:22).

NICHOLAS P. CONNOLLY

San Francisco, Cal.

"THE WORK OF THY HANDS"

"Look upon heaven and earth and all that is in them; and consider that God made them out of nothing and and mankind also."[1]

A handful of soil can measure the promise of a field. When the earth sifts through the fingers like sand, the infant roots will die of anemia. If it yields only a fistful of pebbles, the plant will be murdered in its youth. But if the loam is dark, heavy, and cool, the flower will mature to a healthful bloom. And from a sampling of the soil where the seeds of sanctity are sown, I can weigh the bulk of my harvest of holiness. When my heart grasps the significance of my life it shall yield fruit a hundredfold.

"Before I formed thee in the womb of thy mother I knew thee."[2]

Like all things basic, the truth that contains the meaning of all my days brings me back to my own beginnings. I was not always as I am now. The roots of my present manner of existence spring from a thought according to which God could manifest Himself. I was forever a scripture that might reveal something of the Divine, a shadow God might cast on the earth, a glass to reflect the Father of Lights in a unique pattern. From all eternity I was meant to give distinctive expression to the glory of God in a way that no other could.

"He made us and not we ourselves."[3]

At length the scripture was fulfilled: I was created. The event is a matter of history. It is catalogued as past by our human perspective because the tenses of our speech are concessions to Man's fragmentary vision. My creation is a part of history and so a portion of reality: not a question for speculation, but a fact demanding acceptance. It is true whether I wish it so or not. It remains true even if I ignore its implications.

For the first man it was thousands of years ago. The universe had attained a certain maturity and the earth had been made

[1] *2 Mac.* 7:28.
[2] *Jer.* 1:5.
[3] *Psalm* 99:3.

ready for his entrance. For me it was but several years ago. Contemporaries remember when no one answered to my name. Yet Providence so guided the course of history, and so arranged the lives of all Adam's descendants, that on a certain day—I was created.

"We are His workmanship."[4]

Out of nothingness my spirit came into this world. The handle is carved from the wood and the vessel is molded from the clay. But when the Creator carves His image and the Father chooses His vessel of election, my soul comes fresh from the hands of its Maker full of the fragrance of a divine newness, and I owe my being to God alone.

I have nothing which I have not received. God gave me my first gift when He gave me myself. And His giving goes on and on. For He did not lay down His offering and then go away and leave me. He is always the spring from which I draw my life; my existence comes to me drop by drop. More than the tool depends on the craftsman do I depend on God. I keep my life in a fragile vessel poised in His hands. If He leave hold of me, I shall shatter into nothing.

"I have created him for My glory."[5]

God does not act in vain. I was made to fulfill a function. He gave me a mind to know Him and a will to love Him. If my talent does not gain interest, then I fail in my purpose. I am good for nothing except to be cast into the outer darkness and be cursed. So the whole objective of my life is to praise, reverence, and serve God Our Lord.

"The earth is full of His praise."[6]

The whole universe speeding through space, the starlight that comes to me through thousands of years, the planets constant in their courses for centuries on centuries, the rising of the sun and the going down of the same, praise God Our Lord. The mountain tops of all the world, the thunderous sound of many waters, the

[4] *Eph.* 2:10.
[5] *Isaias* 43:7.
[6] *Hab.* 3:3.

life that thrives on the floor of the ocean, are legends of His power. In their creaturely comeliness gleams the majesty of His countenance. These things praise God by being what they are, but I praise Him also by what I do. These things praise God because they must, and I because I may.

"Hallowed be Thy Name."

The choirs of angels were created to sing a song of praise. And their song is, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts" because they see God and love Him. I must echo their song of praise, for I am the priest of creation and my heart is a sanctuary of praise for God. My prayer rises like incense; my song is the song of creation: all things that are made are good. I must praise God as a child his parents, as a friend a friend; for all who love, praise. I must echo the angels' song now and I shall join it forever.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of His love."[7]

The slave reverences the rod of the master; the son, the anger of his father. Moses removed his shoes before the burning bush, and the Holy of Holies was penetrated only once a year. So must I reverence God Our Lord by bowed head, bended knee, docile silence, and a forthright confession of faith. As the Virgin cradled the Christ Child in her arms and the Mother took her Son's Body from the Cross, I must reverence God in heaven, in the depths of my soul, and in every ambassador of His will.

"His days are like the days of a hireling."[8]

The Master has gone abroad into a foreign country. He has left me His household to manage till He returns. I must not insult the kindness and goodness of my Lord by cravenly hoarding the talents He has given me to invest for profit. If I fail to do His bidding in the tasks appointed me, then when my Master returns, there shall be rebukes for my wickedness and stripes for my sloth. But if I shall be faithful in these little things, He shall place me over many more, and bid me eat and drink with Him, and reward me for every cup of water given in His name.

[7] *Ecclus.* 25:16. [8] *Job* 7:1.

"Blessed are those servants . . . the Lord shall find watching."[9]

I shall go on praising and reverencing God here and hereafter; but for service there shall be rest, even as God rested on the seventh day. Although there is no moment when I am not bound to obey God in this life, yet the years of my service are short: the Master will return sooner than I think. The prudent man provides for the future. He saves—for security. Shall the servants of this world be wiser in their way than I who am a child of light?

"Those who were wise took oil in the vessels they carried."[10]

Five bridesmaids saved their oil, and five did not; five were wise and five were foolish. The five that did met the groom with their lamps lit and went into the feast with him; but the five that did not found the door shut in their faces, because they had no oil for their lamps and the bridegroom had come when they knew it not: he left them to weep in the outer darkness, for their lamps had gone out.

The Lord will come when I know it not. I must save my soul for His return or the door of heaven shall be shut and leave me in the darkness of hell. I must keep my soul trimmed and ready to welcome my Lord or the dross of the world will mar the brilliance of its light, and I shall meet Him with a sputtering flame. I must guard against the stain of every kind of sin and of every least spot that might spoil the steadiness of its light. I must treasure every drop of actual grace, that the rays of my soul might shine more splendidly on His face, and show me more and more the beauty of the Bridegroom.

"The night is coming, when there is no working anymore."[11]

One of the first words a child speaks without any prompting is "mine." As he grows the spirit of possession grows with him and he learns to call more and more objects "his": toys, money, people. Yet a time shall come when he can no longer call them "his." They shall fall from his grasp as things slipped from his fingers when he slept as an infant, and he shall not have the

[9] *Luke* 12:38.
[10] *Matt.* 25:4.
[11] *John* 9:4.

strength to reach out for them. In similar fashion, even my body shall be loosened from my hold; only my soul shall remain in my possession, and for this I myself must be responsible. Whether that soul is saved or lost, no other will determine. For it is alone mine, and mine alone.

"Lay up treasure for yourselves in heaven."[12]

If a man has all the possessions of this world, and that is all he has, what shall he have when these are taken from him? The man who travels through life with a whole caravan of goods must finally abandon his baggage in the end. This world's coin cannot purchase eternal happiness and this world's prestige cannot demand respect in heaven. It is the soul clad in the garment of grace that gains entrance into everlasting life. At the customs of my new country I shall have to declare the grace I have lost and the grace I have gained. This is the standard that measures the success or failure of my life.

CHARLES J. GALLOWAY, S.J.

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Md.

[12] *Matt.* 6:20.

MARIAN STUDIES

America waited for it many years. At last it came: a theological periodical wholly devoted to our Blessed Mother, a publication which would communicate to others the results of study and research carried on by many, concerning Mary's person and prerogatives. *Marian Studies* is its name. Appearing annually, it contains articles of current Marian theology, carefully worked out by the individual members of the Mariological Society of America.[1]

Italy could boast of such a publication already a dozen years ago: the *Marianum*.[2] Spain likewise: *Estudios Marianos*.[3] France offered the results of its studies in the annual *Etudes Mariales*[4] and Belgium in the annual *Mariale Dagen*.[5] Canada printed theological articles from time to time in *Marie*.[6] *Marian Studies* is the youngest of all these publications, but it by no means lags behind them in scholarly attainments. In the few years of its existence it has proved itself to be a valuable contribution to Mariology. A glance at the contents of the first four volumes will give some indication of this:

VOLUME 1 (1950): PRELIMINARIES

1. J. Carol, O.F.M., "The Mariological Movement in the World Today."
2. L. Monheim, S.M., "Some Marian Collections."
3. F. Connell, C.SS.R., "Toward a Systematic Treatment of Mariology."

---

[1] Cf. J. Fenton, "America's Two Theological Associations," *AER*, 125 (1951), 449-58.

[2] *Marianum* is published four times a year at Centro Mariano Internat., Viale Trente Aprile, 6 Rome, Italy.

[3] *Est. Marianos* is published four times a year at Buen Suceso, 22, Madrid, Spain.

[4] *Bulletin de la Société Franc. d'études Mariales,* Libr. Philos. J. Vrin, Place de la Sorbonne, 6, Paris, France.

[5] *Mariale Dagen* is published annually at Norbertijner Abdij, Tongerloo, Belgium.

[6] *Revue Mariale,* Nicolet, Quebec, Canada.

4. D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., "The Use of Scripture in Mariology."
5. E. Burke, C.S.P., "Beginnings of Scientific Mariology."
6. J. Fenton, "Function of Our Lady's Faith in the Church."

VOLUME 2 (1951): CHIEFLY MARY'S CO-REDEMPTION

1. Most Rev. J. Wright, "Mariology in the English-speaking World."
2. L. Riley, "Historical Conspectus of the Doctrine of the Co-Redemption."
3. E. Gallagher, S.J., "Evaluation of Arguments in favor of the Co-Redemption."
4. L. Everett, C.SS.R., "Nexus between Mary's Co-Redemption Role and her other Prerogatives."
5. J. Moynahan, "Our Lady's Merit *de congruo* according to Pope Pius X."
6. G. Bissonnette, A.A., "The Twelfth Ch. of Apocalypse and the Assumption."
7. W. Allen, "Predestination of Mary in the Light of Modern Controversy."

VOLUME 3 (1952): SPIRITUAL MATERNITY

1. W. Sebastian, O.F.M., "Nature of Mary's Spiritual Maternity."
2. G. Shea, "Teaching of the Magisterium on Mary's Spiritual Maternity."
3. E. May, O.F.M.Cap., "Scriptural Basis for Mary's Spiritual Maternity."
4. W. O'Connor, "The Sp. Maternity of our Lady in Tradition."
5. V. Vollert, S.J., "The Place of our Lady in the Mystical Body."
6. F. Setzer, S.M.M., "The Sp. Maternity and St. Louis M. de Montfort."
7. F. Friedel, S.M., "Dogmatic Foundation of Fr. Chaminade's Doctrine."
8. K. Moore, O.Carm., "Queenship of B.V.M. in the Liturgy."
9. E. Ryan, S.J., "Historical Notes on Luke 1:48."
10. W. Parsons, S.J., "Marian Devotion in the Early United States."
11. A. Carr, O.F.M. Conv., "Notes on the Origins of Marian Devotion in Canada."

VOLUME 4 (1953): MARY'S QUEENSHIP

1. F. Vandry, P.A., "The Nature of Mary's Universal Queenship."
2. E. Carroll, O.Carm., "Our Lady's Queenship in the Magisterium of the Church."
3. M. Donnelly, S.J., "Our Lady's Queenship in the Patristic Period."
4. E. Smith, O.F.M., "The Scriptural Basis for Mary's Queenship."
5. A. Fuerst, "Our Lady's Queenship in the Eastern Liturgies."
6. F. Schmidt, O.F.M.Cap., "Our Lady's Queenship in the Light of *Quas primas.*"
7. W. Hill, S.S., "Our Lady's Queenship in the Middle Ages and Modern Times."

One can see what a store-house of Marian theology these volumes will constitute as time goes on. While not many seminaries can be expected to subscribe to a number of foreign publications in this field,[7] *Marian Studies,* published in our own land, deserves to find its way into every seminary of America. It makes a fine gift for the individual priest and seminarian. Experience has shown that the diligent perusal of this publication is one of the best ways to remain abreast of current Mariology.[8] Few are the books on the shelves of seminarian or priest that can be obtained at so reasonable a price, and yet are packed with such an amount of useful knowledge as *Marian Studies.*[9]

BERNARD LE FROIS, S.V.D.

Saint Mary's Mission House
Techny, Ill.

[7] *Marianum*, written in fluent Latin, has a universal appeal.

[8] The *AER* has printed an article on Mariology every month continuously for the last four years.

[9] The first four volumes of *Marian Studies* are obtainable at two dollars each from: J. Carol, O.F.M., Holy Cross Monastery, 600 Sound View Ave., Bronx 72, N. Y.

A PROTESTANT DISCUSSION OF A CATHOLIC DOGMA

The Central Department of Research and Survey of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America issues a weekly bulletin, entitled *Information Service*. The entire four pages of this bulletin, in its Dec. 6, 1952, number, are given over to Catholic teaching. The first three and three-quarter pages deal with the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Church. The rest of the paper paraphrases and cites, in a very sympathetic way, the teachings presented by the Holy Father in his allocution of Nov. 28, 1951, to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

It is the first of the two articles in this particular number of the *Information Service* which carries implications of great importance to our Catholic people. This article, written carefully and courteously by the editor of the bulletin, shows how the testimony of some probably well-meaning Catholics has succeeded in confusing an honest inquirer about the meaning of a Catholic dogma. It clearly exemplifies what can only be regarded as a most unfortunate situation.

The editor tells his readers how he came to prepare this article in the first place. He was interested, from the point of view of "interfaith relations," in the Catholic interpretation of the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Church. He considered the activity of the ecclesiastical authorities in disciplining Father Feeney, and the teaching of Professor O'Neill in the book *Catholicism and American Freedom*, as evidence that the Church rejected a "literal application" of the axiom *"extra ecclesiam nulla salus,"* and approved of a "liberal" explanation of this doctrine.

The unfavorable criticism of Professor O'Neill's book in the June issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* influenced several of the editor's co-religionists to challenge him to recognize "the evidence thus furnished that the official Catholic position is narrowly exclusive, no matter what individual Catholics may say." The editor acknowledges that he took the matter very seriously and that he proceeded to assemble "an impressive body of authori-

tative opinion." This "authoritative opinion" turns out to be expressed in a series of communications from prominent Catholics.

While he was still engaged in the work of assembling his opinions, however, the Archbishop of Boston published the complete text of a letter he had received from the Holy Office in 1949. Hence, the body of the article, as it now appears, is made up of four elements, a fairly complete set of citations from the doctrinal portion of the Holy Office letter, expressions of authoritative opinions from prominent Catholics, the editor's brief comments on the Protestant doctrine on the necessity of the Church for salvation, and a highly interesting conclusion.

The main points brought out in the doctrinal section of the Holy Office letter to Archbishop Cushing may be summed up as follows:

(1) The teaching that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church is a dogma, which the Church has always taught and will always teach infallibly.

(2) The only true meaning of this dogma is that which the Church has always understood.

(3) The Church teaches that it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of precept, by reason of Our Lord's own command.

(4) The Church likewise teaches that it is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means.

(5) By reason of the Church's necessity for salvation with the necessity of means, a man cannot be saved unless he be incorporated into the Church actually as a member, or at least be joined to the Church by a *votum* or *desiderium*.

(6) In the case of a person who is invincibly ignorant of the Catholic Church, God will accept an intention or desire that is implicit.

(7) The possibility of salvation for a person who has only an implicit desire of the Catholic Church has been brought out in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.

(8) The *Mystici Corporis* also taught that "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."

(9) It is necessary, in order that one be saved, that the desire by which he is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity.

(10) An implicit desire cannot produce its effect unless the person desiring the Church have true supernatural faith.

In summarizing the doctrinal content of the Holy Office letter for his readers, the editor of the *Information Service* makes no reference whatsoever to the last three points. He touches upon the first seven points quite effectively, using the words of the official English translation of the Holy Office letter.

After outlining the content of the Holy Office communication to Archbishop Cushing, the editor of the *Information Service* prints excerpts from the replies sent to him by eight prominent Catholics whom he had questioned about the matter. It is only fair to state that, from the context of the *Information Service* article, these explanations were requested and most probably actually written prior to the appearance of the full text of the Holy Office letter.

Nevertheless, it is quite disturbing to see that all of the eight unnamed Catholic priests and laymen whose replies to the editor of the *Information Service* are published in that periodical wrote inadequately or inaccurately on the Church's necessity for eternal salvation. Four of these men offered interpretations of the doctrine itself. The others gave practical applications of their interpretation of this teaching. From the eight responses he received and published in part, the Protestant editor drew conclusions that showed how badly he had been misled by his correspondents.

One of the authorities to whom the editor of the *Information Service* appealed, a priest identified only as a learned and eminent Catholic theologian, gave a confusing explanation of membership in the Church. He spoke of good non-Catholics as "unwitting members of the Body of Christ which is His Church (although not 'professed' members but members *in voto*, as the Latin term so aptly expresses it) even though they be through no fault of their own quite ignorant of its existence or honestly convinced that what they knew as the Catholic Church is not what it claims to be."

In this way he gives rise to the impression that there are two classes of membership in the Church, a "professed" membership, and a membership *in voto*. Actually, as the Latin term itself informs us quite clearly, the man who belongs to the Church only

in voto or in desire is not a member of the Church at all. He is, rather, one who seeks to become a member of the Church, and he is within it only in the sense that the Church is the object of his desire or intention.

Another priest, designated by the editor of the *Information Service* as "an eminent Catholic theologian and educator," has given an explanation which is vitiated to a great extent by his use of the discredited concept of the soul of the Church as "made up of invisible elements who are joined together internally in one spiritual society through the binding force of faith and charity which we call Sanctifying Grace." This soul of the Church is distinguished from the body of the Church, "the visible elements or those persons who by their external presence are joined together in one Christian society under the leadership of the Bishop of Rome."

Two of the authorities whose answers are published in part in the *Information Service* are identified as lay Catholic philosophers. One of these presents a teaching on membership in the Church according to which a man who has never heard of the Church or, who, having heard of it, may not recognize it for what it is, "could be a member of the Church without being, externally and visibly, a Catholic." He writes again that, "In this sense, a non-Catholic in good faith is a member of the Mystical Body of Christ and will be saved."

The second lay Catholic philosopher has given an utterly crass and cynical exposition of the doctrine. He explains it as a logical deduction from false premises. According to this "authority," the teaching that the Church is necessary for salvation is based upon the assumption that the sacramental system is the divinely ordained means through which human salvation is to be effected and upon the claim that this system is non-existent outside of the Catholic Church. "But," he assures the Protestant editor, "salvation can be effected otherwise, either through sacramental institutions borrowed and conserved outside (e.g., Protestant baptism) or through Divine Providence." And he concludes that "Since it is the soundest of teachings to assert that the bounty of this Providence is endless, it follows that every human being of good will shall find peace." It would be difficult to find a more perfect exam-

ple of the process by which the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation is reduced to an empty formula.

Two Catholic journalists are found in the list of authorities cited by the editor of the *Information Service*. One of these asserts that "There no doubt are Catholics who do believe that 'outside the Church there is no salvation' means that all who are not active members of the Catholic Church during their lifetime have no chance of salvation, but they would represent a minute minority opinion." He believes, however, that Protestants, with their insistence upon private interpretation, are in no position to deny this particular private interpretation on the part of the Catholic minority of which he speaks.

Despite the fact that the editor of the *Information Service* professes himself as impressed by this observation, Catholic theologians will find only a matter for bitter regret in a statement by one of their co-religionists to the effect that any minority of Catholics hold a doctrinal position opposed to the explicit teaching of the Holy Office. The very fact that the Church honors as martyrs people who died for the faith before they had the opportunity to become members of the Church through the reception of Baptism has always rendered the position which our Catholic journalist ascribes to some of his fellow-Catholics definitely untenable. The appearance of the complete text of the Holy Office letter took away all excuse for an error of this sort on the part of any Catholic.

The other Catholic journalist cited as an authority in the *Information Service* takes it for granted that the Protestant wife of a Catholic will be saved by reason of her fidelity to her own religion. "A lay scholar of international reputation" assured the editor of *Information Service* that he and hosts of others are inside the Church in that they belong to its soul. Finally, "a priest of high rank, well known for his benign spirit" assured the editor of the Protestant periodical that he "would not be interested in a heaven which had no one but Catholics in it."

After citing these melancholy doctrinal statements by his Catholic doctrinal authorities, the editor of the *Information Service* assures his readers that the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation is a part of Protestant, as well as of Catholic, belief. He cites Calvin and Melanchthon to this effect, and then brings out

the fact that the Protestants did not identify the Church with any of the individual denominational bodies. In making this assertion, he is merely re-stating the old Protestant claim that the true Church of Jesus Christ, the group which is necessary for salvation, is invisible, that is to say, not a genuine organized society at all.

The Catholic writers, on the other hand, upheld the divinely revealed truth that the true Church of the New Testament is an organized society, the religious society of which the Bishop of Rome is the visible head in this world. They maintained that this organization, with its members, fully discernible as members, is actually the kingdom of God on earth, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. And so, of course, they recognized the fact that this society is truly necessary for salvation.

Their Protestant opponents seem not to have been particularly astonished or dismayed by the fact that the Catholic teachers represented the Catholic Church as necessary for man's eternal salvation. Both sides were perfectly convinced of the divinely revealed truth that there is in this world a true Church of Jesus Christ which is requisite for the attainment of man's eternal and supernatural destiny. They were perfectly aware of the fact that there exists some corporate unit within which alone men may have salvific contact with God through Jesus Christ Our Lord.

The question on which these men were divided was this: just where is this true Church, this Mystical Body of Christ, to be found?

The Protestants claimed that it was to be found in the unorganized totality of the men and women in the state of grace in this world. The Catholics, on the other hand, rightfully and accurately asserted that it was to be found in the organized religious society which we know as the Catholic Church, and in this society alone. That was the point on which they differed.

Hence the Protestants were no more disedified at finding that the Catholics asserted that their Church was necessary for salvation than the Catholics were at learning that the Protestant teachers held that their own "invisible Church" was something outside of which no one would be saved. Logically the Protestants would have expected that any unwillingness on the part of Catholics to

assert that their Church is requisite for salvation must in some way involve an abandonment of the Catholic position itself.

Such, actually, has been the result of the answers given by these prominent Catholic authorities to the editor of the *Information Service* last year. The Protestant editor closes the discussion of the Catholic dogma on the necessity of the Church for salvation with the following two paragraphs.

> Years ago, in a conversation with an eminent Lutheran minister who was stressing the primacy of the individual believer, the editor remarked, "But you remember that Luther said that one who would find Christ must first find the Church." "Yes," he replied, "I know. He did say that, and I've said it, too. But it isn't so."
>
> This seems to present a close parallel to the difficulty that Catholic theologians encounter when called on to explain and justify a doctrine which on the matter-of-fact level can only sound self-contradictory.

In other words, from the statements made by the Catholics to whom he appealed for their explanation of the teaching that there is no salvation outside the Church, the editor seems to have drawn the inference that, although the Church itself makes this assertion, Catholics themselves simply do not admit that it is true. In the light of the answers he has received, he has been led to think that the Catholic profession of the faith is basically hypocritical.

Objectively, it would be impossible to do a greater disservice to the cause of Christ than to create or to encourage the impression that some dogma of His Church is not accepted sincerely and enthusiastically by His people. Quite manifestly the individuals who sent in their explanations to the editor of the *Information Service* really intended to act as loyal and intelligent Catholics. Yet, despite their obviously good intentions, they have succeeded only in reminding the Protestant editor of the Lutheran minister who, in a private conversation, rejected as untrue what Luther had taught and what he himself had previously asserted.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE USE OF THE BIRETTA

Question: Is there an obligation for a priest to wear the biretta in going to the altar before Mass and in returning afterward to the sacristy? So many priests fail to do so that I wonder if they regard it as merely a matter of counsel. Is it a sin not to use the biretta on these occasions?

Answer: Since the rubrics prescribe that the priest wear the biretta when he goes to the altar and returns to the sacristy, the biretta must be regarded as an obligatory element of his sacred garb. Of course, it would not be a mortal sin to neglect to wear it, but *per se* it would be a venial sin. For a sufficient reason a priest would be excused from this obligation—for example, if he had forgotten to take his biretta on a trip. But there is no justification for the deliberate and habitual omission of this rubrical feature. Naturally, this does not apply to the religious priests who do not use a biretta, such as the Franciscans and the Dominicans who wear the cowl instead.

EXTREME UNCTION UNCONSCIOUSLY RECEIVED BY THE CONSCIOUS

Question: A priest engaged in hospital work may have reason to fear that if he advises a person in danger of death to receive Extreme Unction, he may make the patient fearful and discouraged, to the detriment of his mental and physical condition. Moreover, in such an event the relatives and the doctors may feel and show resentment toward the priest, so that his work in the hospital is rendered less effective. In a situation of this kind would the priest be allowed to induce the sick person merely to go to confession and receive Holy Communion, and then administer Extreme Unction without informing the patient of what is being done? The proce-

dure would be to confer this sacrament by a single anointing on the forehead, with the short form, the sick person meanwhile believing that he is receiving only the priest's blessing. For it would seem that the general intention of receiving the last rites of the Church when death is approaching—an intention which every Catholic is presumed to have—would suffice for the valid reception of Extreme Unction, even though the recipient is unaware that he is receiving it here and now. The licit and fruitful reception would be assured by the previous confession.

Answer: There is good reason to believe that Extreme Unction would be validly administered in the case described by the questioner, because of the sick person's general habitual intention of receiving the spiritual benefits which the Church confers on her members when they are actually in danger of death. But the procedure itself, I believe, is most objectionable for other reasons. In the first place, it is surely the earnest desire of the Church that whenever one of her members is in danger of death he should be made aware of his condition, if he is conscious, so that he may put his best efforts into preparing for the entrance of his soul into eternity. The fact that he has been to confession and received Holy Communion does not supply for an explicit realization of the danger of death. When a person knows that only a brief time will pass before he stands before the judgment seat of God, he is inclined to be much more exact in his confession and more fervent in his contrition than when he regards the reception of the sacrament of Penance as an ordinary act of devotion.

Furthermore, the Church surely wishes one who is conscious when he is anointed to realize that he is receiving a most important sacrament—a sacrament which, according to some theologians, is ordained to prepare the soul for immediate entrance into heaven. Surely, it is not in accordance with the dignity of this sacrament to confer it (apart from the case of necessity) without the prescribed number of anointings and the beautiful prayers that the Church has added, and by a subterfuge, as if it were a distasteful medicine given to a timid child.

If the method proposed by the questioner were adopted, what would the priest do in regard to the prayers for the dying? They are not strictly obligatory, yet every good Catholic should be

glad to have them recited over him when the hour of death is approaching.

We should not yield to the spirit of paganism which views death as the greatest possible evil, and has little or no concern for the life beyond the grave; and our Catholic people should be warned against this spirit. When a Catholic is dying, he should be informed of this fact, kindly but definitely. Even if there is only a probable danger of death, he should know the truth about his condition, at least if death is likely to come soon. In most cases any fear or anxiety that may be aroused by such an announcement is felt by the relatives rather than by the sick person himself. But even if the patient is himself disturbed and discouraged by being informed of his precarious condition, it is better that such a situation be permitted to happen than that he be allowed to pass into eternity unwarned, perhaps unprepared to meet his Judge.

THE REPETITION OF EXTREME UNCTION

Question: It is evident from the Code (Can. 940 § 2) that Extreme Unction may be repeated in the same illness if the sick person has rallied (*convaluerit*) and then fallen into another danger of death. However, this concerns the *right* to another reception of this sacrament. Is there a *duty* to receive it?

Answer: If the sick person recovers to such an extent that the danger of death seems certainly to have passed away (although he is still sick) and then lapses again into the danger of death, it would seem that Extreme Unction *must* be received again. For the efficacy of this sacrament perdures only as long as the danger of death continues; hence, in the case described, the salutary effects of the first anointing are no longer present when the second danger arises. It should be noted that in referring to an obligation to receive Extreme Unction we are abstracting from the question whether there is *per se* a grave obligation to receive this sacrament at all; but at least there is a light obligation.

If there is only probability that the first danger of death had passed away with the temporary improvement, the sacrament *may* be repeated, but there is no obligation to receive it again. If it is

administered, the conferring should be conditional. In the words of Fr. Kilker: "When there is a partial recovery, whereby the patient is placed probably out of danger of death, only to be followed by a relapse, Extreme Unction may be repeated, just as it can be given originally when there is a prudent fear that danger is present. In such a case all that is necessary would be a probable judgment that a new danger of death has arisen" (Kilker, *Extreme Unction* [St. Louis: Herder, 1927], p. 194).

From the fact that there is probably no grave obligation *per se* to receive Extreme Unction when a person is in danger of death, and no obligation to ask again for this sacrament after having received it once, when it is only probable that the first danger had passed away, one may not conclude that the obligation of the pastor to confer it is parallel. He has a duty which is *per se* grave to give Extreme Unction to any one of his flock who reasonably requests it, even though the person himself has no strict obligation to receive it.

HOLY COMMUNION ON HOLY SATURDAY

Question: In a convent chapel, where Mass is not celebrated on Holy Saturday morning, would it be allowed to distribute Holy Communion to the nuns at any time?

Answer: The Code has the following prescription regarding the administration of the Holy Eucharist on Holy Saturday: "On Holy Saturday Holy Communion cannot be administered to the faithful except during Mass or directly and immediately afterward" (Can. 867, § 3). However, it is matter of discussion whether or not this prescription applies to the distribution of Holy Communion in a chapel where the services of the Easter Vigil are not conducted. Genicot leaves the question unsettled (*Institutiones theologiae moralis* [Brussels, 1927], II, n. 187); Damen says that Holy Communion may not be given in such a chapel (*Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], II, n. 128); Cappello states that it is lawful to distribute Holy Communion in chapels where the functions are not held, provided there is a just and reasonable cause (*De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n. 433). This last opinion, I believe, can

be safely followed. A just and reasonable cause would be present if some of the nuns could not attend the services in church, or would find it very difficult to fast through the solemn function.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

BLESSING OF SACRED VESSELS

Question: Recently I had a ciborium and ostensorium regilded and I wondered if it was necessary to have them blessed again. Also, I noted in this column that if the chalice base and cup are separated it must be reconsecrated. How about a chalice that is so constructed that the cup screws onto the base of the chalice?

Answer: We are told that the ciborium should be blessed. If the ciborium has lost its blessing by any noticeable break making it unfit for sacred use, then upon its being repaired it should be blessed again. Simple regilding does not demand another blessing. The same is true of the ostensorium, although Msgr. Harold Collins maintains that the monstrance need not be blessed.

Chalices that are made so that the cup is removable do not need to be reconsecrated when gilded but only when the repair work was demanded because the sacred vessel could no longer be used for Holy Mass.

SERVICES FOR NON-CATHOLICS

Question: Considering the contemporary leaning-over-backwards to oblige non-Catholics (many of them unappreciative and misinterpreting the favor done them) in conducting mixed marriages before side altars and communion railings, under what circumstances could a pastor conduct a side altar funeral for the departed non-Catholic spouse?

Answer: It is difficult to see how a non-Catholic funeral could be held in the Catholic Church. The first step in such procedure would be to consult the Ordinary of the diocese. Our inquirer re-

marks that many non-Catholics show a lack of genuine appreciation for the privilege already granted of mixed marriages in church. After all it is a concession on the part of the church and in many dioceses such a request must be made in writing in order to impress this thought upon the Catholic party. A privilege or concession is quite distinct and definitely different from a right.

BENEDICTION PROBLEM

Question: I have a few questions about Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Is it necessary to have a lunette case and if so is it necessary to have it veiled? Where precisely is this case placed during exposition or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament?

Answer: The custodia or case for the lunette is required if the Sacred Host is not kept in a receptacle that is made of two round pieces of glass. If the Sacred Host is enclosed in such a device the custodia is not necessary. Some of the authors strongly recommend a custodia regardless of this type of container for the Blessed Sacrament. Some follow the custom of veiling the custodia like the ciborium and base their practice on the theory that any vessel containing the Blessed Sacrament should be veiled. However, there is no strict regulation demanding that the custodia be veiled.

During exposition or benediction of the Blessed Sacrament the same custom is followed as when Holy Communion is distributed. The veil should be placed off the corporal but the lunette case or custodia should be kept on the corporal.

ABSOLUTION AFTER FUNERAL MASS

Question: When the absolution follows a funeral Mass does the celebrant turn to genuflect after he sings "Pater Noster" and before proceeding around the casket?

Answer: The rubrics tell the celebrant to proceed immediately after he sings "Pater Noster." He bows to the crucifix held by an altar boy or sub-deacon but does genuflect before receiving the thurible and giving up the aspergil.

PREACHING AT MASS

Question: What about the custom followed by some priests of removing the maniple or both maniple and chasuable when preaching at the Mass they are offering?

Answer: Such a custom is known to exist in certain localities but without the approval of any rubricians. The approval of such a custom has never been noted in any of the books. The only reason for such a practice would be one of convenience and expediency, let us say to allow greater freedom for gestures in the pulpit or perhaps greater comfort during very warm and uncomfortable weather.

LARGE VOTIVE CANDLES

Question: During the Forty Hours' Devotion in a small country church where there are not too many people for adoration and where there is some danger of fire is it permitted to use the large votive candles to fulfill the requirement of twenty lighted candles? Also, would one be permitted to use this type of candle for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass each morning?

Answer: The law demands twenty candles to be lighted for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament during the Forty Hours' Devotion. Nothing is said about the shape or size of the candle. If the large votive candles meet the requirements set down by the code or diocesan regulations there could be no serious objection, even though such a practice does seem a bit unusual.

It certainly would be quite out of the ordinary and out of place to have two such candles lighted for Holy Mass and thus fulfill the regulation. It is difficult to see any justification for this practice.

SANCTUARY LAMP

Question: What are the regulations about the position of the sanctuary lamp? Must it be suspended or will a pedestal in the sanctuary fulfill the law?

Answer: The law directs that the sanctuary lamp should be before the tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament, and not at

an angle so that it is actually behind the door of the tabernacle. The Congregation of Sacred Rites has explicitly prohibited the custom of placing the sanctuary lamp on the altar proper. It may be suspended in the center of the sanctuary but not in such a way so as to obstruct the view of the altar and the priest by the congregation. The custom of having the sanctuary lamp in a metal bracket fastened to a wall in the sanctuary is approved, provided, of course, that it is in front of the tabernacle. Likewise, the practice of having the sanctuary lamp on a stand or pedestal to one side of the sanctuary is in good order, provided it is in front of the tabernacle and not to the rear of the sanctuary.

LAVABO DISH

Question: Recently I offered Mass in the parish church of a friend. At the lavabo the altar boy presented a bowl or dish already filled with water and a towel. I had never seen that done before and wondered if the regulation concerning the cruet and lavabo dish had been discarded.

Answer: All the rubricians direct the altar boy to pour the water on the thumbs and index fingers of the celebrant of the Mass. Nothing is said about presenting a towel and a dish filled with water.

NATIONAL ANTHEM IN CHURCH

Question: Is it forbidden to sing the National Anthem in church at a special occasion when state and civic dignitaries, mostly non-Catholic, are present?

Answer: The National Anthem is not liturgical music and hence cannot be part of any liturgical function. If the National Anthem is sung after the Mass has ended we see no particular problem. One writer justifies the congregational singing of the "Star Spangled Banner" by holding that the Ritual and Pontificale contain blessings for flags and swords and ceremonials for the coronation of kings and queens.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

THE LIFE OF JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS. By John Tracy Ellis. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952. Two vols., boxed; pp. 1500. $17.50.

The Bruce Publishing Company can make an excellent case for its contention that the publication of *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons* is the "major publishing event" of 1952. By the same token and if only through this single work, the publication of this book would suffice to place Fr. John Tracy Ellis in the foremost ranks of scholars in America and of Catholic historians everywhere.

As a matter of fact, of course, Fr. Ellis has long since established his competence to undertake a work of the magnitude of his present historico-biographical study of the Baltimore cardinal. He brought to the six-year task of research and writing required to produce these two volumes a rich experience as managing editor of *The Catholic Historical Review* and as the author of such previous publications as *Anti-Papal Legislation in Medieval England, Cardinal Consalvi and Anglo-Papal Relations, The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America,* and *A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States.*

Future like bibliographies will of necessity accord a place of high honor to Fr. Ellis' life of Gibbons. Pre-publication readers of the work have welcomed it with a critical enthusiasm which guarantees its place among historical studies. Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger has declared the book "a landmark in American biography, readable, judicious and thoroughly documented." Professor Ray Allen Billington, hailing Father Ellis' accomplishment as "magnificent," "meticulous," "vivid and objective," details the particular features of the book which appealed to him as a professional historian. He pays tribute to the indefatigable scholarship of the author and declares: "He has written more than a biography; his work is the best study yet attempted of the adjustment of the American Catholic Church to an industrialized United States."

It may safely be anticipated that the judgment of other trained historians will be no less cordial to the scientific merits of Fr. Ellis' truly monumental study. The interest of this *Review* is somewhat different from that of the historian, and so we may well defer to other journals for the evaluation of *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons* considered as a scientific, historical study.

Readers of this periodical are more likely to be interested in the significance of Fr. Ellis' book to the American priest. Considered in this light, his work is likely to prove the most absorbing and discussed literature to fall into clerical hands for many a long month. Cardinal Gibbons was pre-eminently an American priest in the most wholesome and legitimate sense of the phrase. He was the second such native priest to wear a cardinal's hat and therefore to take his place among the members of the Sacred College side by side with representatives of the highest types of Catholic priests and prelates from the Old World nations, as a pure product of the characteristic pattern of the unchanging priesthood in the New World.

It is the portraiture of such a priest and prelate which emerges from these pages. No one may properly question the complete Catholicism of this native American; neither may any one challenge the unmistakable Americanism of this Roman cardinal.

Fr. Ellis makes no explicit effort to be polemical about this topical aspect of the significance of his hero; it would have been beneath the high level of his intent and scholarly performance to do so. But those of us who are obliged by the debates of the hour to be mindful of the felicity with which American political idealism and Catholic orthodox faith can be and are blended in priests and bishops of the United States will be grateful for the luminous lesson on this point which shines through the pages of Fr. Ellis' two volumes.

The priests of every part of America will find rewarding reading here. The South remains almost as much a missionary area of the Church in America as it was in 1868 when Bishop James Gibbons was installed in his little pro-cathedral at Wilmington, North Carolina. Present-day priests of that region will read of his mission in North Carolina and even his work in Richmond, beginning in 1872, with inspiration and profit. Priests in those sections of the United States which have seen the rise of industrialism and the coming to mature power of the trade union movement will learn salutary lessons of prudent patience and intelligent vision from the chapters which recount the story of the Knights of Labor, the case of Henry George and Dr. McGlynn and certain of the problems of the peace which followed World War I.

Priests identified with academic and educational work will derive stimulation and perhaps occasional comfort from the review of the forms taken by perennial controversies and problems surrounding Catholic education in the days of giants indeed. The chapters on the beginnings of the Catholic University of America, on the issue of public *versus* parochial schools and on Gibbons' last years as Chancellor

of the University will be mines of information, sometimes normative, for these.

Happily there are now few parts of America where nationalities still remain in conflict within the Catholic Church. In any such sections the particularly carefully done chapter on this complex worry will be fruitful reading.

Only the most malicious seekers after mischief are likely to find substantial evidence in our day of that "Americanism" the allegations of which worried certain Europeans and plagued Catholic Americans in the first years of Gibbons' cardinalate. The opening chapter of Fr. Ellis' second volume puts this whole matter in its proper perspective.

The full portrait of Gibbons the man, priest, citizen, and prelate is delineated in the last three hundred and more pages of the study. Fr. Ellis begins these concluding chapters with an impressive picture of Cardinal Gibbons as "the international churchman." We learn of the interest with which the opinions of the Cardinal-archbishop of Baltimore were received outside America when he spoke on questions involving other peoples and places than those of his own country. However, one cannot but question whether by Gibbons' time the Church in America had reached a finished stature such that any of her clergy or hierarchy yet counted very significantly as influencers of genuinely international thought, particularly on broadly political questions. The controversy between the Cardinal and Paul Sabatier on Church and State in France would hardly prove that the reactions of the Baltimore Cardinal produced significant repercussions in France, for example, even though it may be evidence that the pattern of Church-State relations working out in the United States was already beginning to be of great interest to Europeans, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. One fears that Fr. Ellis may have overestimated a bit the "commanding prestige" which James Gibbons of Baltimore enjoyed "throughout the world" (II, 368).

It is undoubtedly true, of course, that Gibbons exercised a constructive influence on many points of papal policy which inevitably had world-wide implications. Perhaps the clearest example is afforded by the candid, even courageous, manner in which he persuaded Pope Leo XIII to abstain from any shortsighted action in the question of the Knights of Labor, though it must be acknowledged that Pope Leo was personally more likely to espouse Gibbons' liberal outlook than the more conservative, not to say reactionary, sentiments of Cardinal Taschereau. The great weight of Gibbons' counsel and the historic significance to the trade union movement of his position are not diminished by the fact that there were some providentially likeminded

prelates in Europe at the time whose progressive social teachings were given new prestige and force when the American Cardinal made his valiant, generous stand on the Knights.

When he comes to the discussion of "the leader of the American Church," Fr. Ellis is on immeasurably better ground and he marshalls his material impressively as he establishes the Cardinal's pre-eminence as the leader of the Catholic Church of the United States. The picture which he sketches is heart-warming as it reveals a prelate who from the outset of his episcopal career had shown the qualities that inspire confidence in others, with the result that the Cardinal's leadership among his brother bishops "produced not only a profound respect for his judgment, but also a deep and abiding love for the man" (II, 437).

Fr. Ellis is on ground no less firm when he writes of Gibbons the American citizen. Here, too, the heart is warmed by abundant and even eloquent justification Fr. Ellis is able to provide for the striking tribute President Theodore Roosevelt paid the Catholic Cardinal when he wrote in 1917: "Taking your life as a whole, I think, you now occupy the position of being the most respected, and venerated, and useful citizen of our country." We priests will reap great advantage from the sober study of Gibbons' emphasis on civic virtue, on the need for alert citizenship, on the harmony which exists between the Catholic Church and the American Republic, on the proper and powerful place of the good priest in the life of the community and on the reasons why the minister of Christ cannot be indifferent to social, political, and economic problems affecting the integral well-being of his people. Perhaps, however, we priests will derive chiefly negative advantage from the example of the Cardinal's occasional indications of his personal political preferences.

All priests should scan with special care the chapter on Gibbons' qualities and career as a preacher and writer. *The Faith of Our Fathers* is probably still almost "a fixture in every household," as a West Virginia pastor vowed he would make it. Most of us priests have long suspected that no other single book has made a comparable number of converts in America; Fr. Ellis brings together good reasons to suppose that its powers in this direction have not diminished. He cites numerous cases of conversions directly or indirectly due to the reading of this simple yet cogent classic statement of the case for a Catholicism.

(The present writer once visited a pastor in southwestern France who was looked upon as a "revolutionary" by local Catholics, many of them being themselves under ban or suspicion for their *Action française* sympathies. His "wild" ideas on the social responsibilities of the clergy, the role of the Church in a democratic society, and like points had prompted more than one "true believer" to attempt to embarrass the

good man with his bishop. He declared that his consolation for years had been the frequent reading of pertinent chapters of *The Faith of Our Fathers,* a copy of which had been given him by a Catholic chaplain in World War I. The priestly dreamer after a more humane and Christian world order, incidentally, proved unable to pronounce correctly the Cardinal's name or to locate within a thousand miles the city of Baltimore!)

Perhaps it is beyond the proper duties of a historian and scientific biographer, but one might wish that Fr. Ellis had found it possible to offer us some sort of incidental study of the Baltimore Cardinal in comparison and contrast with some of the great princes of the Church from other lands who were his contemporaries in the College of Cardinals. Such a comparative study, however brief, would be intriguing and illuminating; it would put this typically America cardinal in a perspective which would help history evaluate his significance and appreciate his personality.

This much is certain; Fr. Ellis has made it necessary that the lives of the other and later American cardinals be written with uncommon care, competence, and completeness. He has set an exceedingly high standard of scholarship and literary skill for such other biographical studies. He makes one wish that he himself might be able to take on the extremely important work of gathering in like volumes the lives and times of each of our American Cardinals lest any one of them suffer the disparagement of treatment by a biographer of gifts not to be compared with those uniquely demonstrated by Father Ellis.

✠ JOHN WRIGHT

FROM AN ABUNDANT SPRING. The Walter Farrell Memorial Volume of *The Thomist.* Edited by the Staff of *The Thomist.* New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1952. Pp. x+555. $7.50.

The late Walter Farrell's life had in it a certain element of paradox. As Fr. Coffey showed in his touching commemorative article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* he was a frail man, yet he assumed the physically arduous duties of a naval chaplain; he was a shy man, yet he was to achieve fame in that little arena which strikes terror into the heart of the shy—the pulpit; he was a serious man, yet his lambent humor was an alembic by which the genius of Thomas Aquinas was distilled into a wine not too heady for the average contemporary; he was a strict man, yet he possessed a warmth and friendliness which made him one of the best-loved figures in his Order.

From an Abundant Spring (the title is taken from an exhortation of Leo XIII to Thomists to ". . . give largely and abundantly—the

pure streams of wisdom which flow from the Angelic Doctor as from a perennial and abundant spring") is the tribute of the editorial staff of the journal which Fr. Farrell himself helped to establish. The twenty-six essays written by specialists who were his friends, confreres, and admirers, not only commemorate Fr. Farrell, but in the main, they are written in the idiom that he used so effectively in bringing the philosophic and theological synthesis of the Angelic Doctor to the English-speaking world.

In his foreword, Cardinal Stritch has captured well the spirit of this man whose premature death has deprived contemporary Thomism of one of its most articulate voices: "Father Farrell suggested the embodiment of an ideal: he was, in America, the priest-Thomist of our times . . . He was articulate, he was daring, he was humble . . . With extraordinary gifts of mind and sanctity of soul, he worked incessantly to help men see divine truth, and seeing, to live it . . ."

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

VOCATION. The English version of *Le discernement de vocations de religieuses.* Translated by Walter Mitchell. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1952. Pp. VII+116. $2.75.

This little volume is by no means a treatise on religious vocation but a compilation of nine papers, by as many writers, presenting some aspects of religious vocation and some of the reasons for today's problem of shortage of vocations to the religious life.

The first paper, by Dom O. Rousseau, one of the most worthwhile of the series, offers a brief historical background, with a study of St. Anthony's vocation as recorded by St. Athanasius. He analyzes the call to perfection in Patristic Tradition. "The call to evangelical perfection," he writes, "is a counsel given to every Christian, and the religious life as such is only the Christian life carried as far as possible to its logical end." The Apostolic and the Patristic doctrines on religious perfection are placed in contrast with the now prevailing crisis of religious life. The author seems to attribute this crisis not so much to a lack of the supernatural spirit as to "a lack of contact with the proper food for Christian minds, and especially with Holy Scriptures." This, he believes, has diminished the religious values essential to our vocations. Legalism is blamed for shrinkage of the spirit. "The vow has become a thing for casuists and their acrobatics. Obedience has degenerated into observance of a set of trifling details, respect for which is the main thing inculcated in training of

postulants." He also contrasts the life of early Christian communities in which souls were broadened by the great liberty of love with some modern communities where "the slightest offence becomes an everlasting grudge on which the soul feeds day after day, until at last it is incurably poisoned."

A bit of criticism is leveled even at modern theology: "The real reason for the decay of so many communities is, surely, simply this: that our theology has come adrift from its sources." According to this author, Christian doctrine, as reflected in religious life, has given away to "a lean diet of superficial devotion"; legalism has been allowed to invade every domain of religious thought, letting the mystery evaporate. "The girls who join religious Communities . . . cannot but feel stifled in these noviciates with all their petty rules, where the chief preoccupation is to train the postulants in the routine formation of another age, and where the girl who yesterday did not even wear stockings must today wear long boots and three skirts."

Additional constructive criticism and practical suggestions are found in the other papers as well so as to make this little book worth reading for all those who are now interested in promoting more and better vocations for our religious communities.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

THE LIFE OF CHRIST (Popular Edition). By Giuseppe Ricciotti. Translated by Alba I. Zizzamia. Abridged and edited by Aloysius Croft. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952. Pp. xiii+402. $3.50.

In 1946 an English translation of Abbot Ricciotti's *Life of Christ* was published in this country. Already recognized by European scholars as a masterpiece, it had been translated into ten languages and had gone through innumerable editions. It was a critical study of the life of Christ which incorporated the findings of the latest (1941) research and scholarship. Miss Zizzamia's translation was superb. One was never conscious of reading a book originally composed in a foreign tongue.

Now there has been published an abridgment of the complete *Life*. The value of the original work long since universally recognized, it is precisely as an abridgment that we review the Popular Edition. In this connection, some comparisons with the full length work seem in order. The 1946 publication is some seven hundred pages in length, two hundred and sixteen of which are given to a critical introduction. It contains copious maps and diagrams and thirty-four full page

photographs of modern day Palestine. Appended is a Scriptural index and a seventeen page general index. The Popular Edition has been shortened to some four hundred pages. Unfortunately, but obviously for reasons of cost, the full page photographs have been omitted. There are, however, four maps, some smaller pictures and diagrams, plus a good general index of six pages. The Scriptural index has been omitted.

It is the opinion of this reviewer that Mr. Croft has succeeded admirably in his by no means easy task of condensation. By reducing the critical introduction to seventy-three pages, by omitting or translating Greek and Latin phrases, by deleting lengthy footnotes, and by skillfully shortening each of the original chapters, he has given us a life of our Lord which still fulfills well Abbot Ricciotti's purpose and which is, nonetheless, suited to the needs of the busy priest and the interested non-professional reader. A successful abridgment demands discriminating judgment. Mr. Croft has exhibited just such judgment in his condensation of *The Life of Christ.*

His ability is particularly evident in the Critical Introduction. In the sixty-seven pages of the Popular Edition is to be found practically all the pertinent information contained in its more lengthy counterpart of two hundred and sixteen pages. The only consideration of any note that has been completely omitted is the treatment of the rationalist interpretation of the life of Jesus. Apart from this technical question, the substance of the original introduction is present in the Popular Edition. It gives the reader the proper background for a profitable and intelligent reading of the life of Christ.

In his introduction to the full length *Life* Abbot Ricciotti states: "It has been my wish to write an exclusively historical and documentary work. I have studied the ancient fact and not the modern theory, the solidity of the documents and not the flimsiness of any interpretation presently the fashion." His *Life of Christ,* just as truly in the condensation as in its expanded form, is both critical and objective, and yet eminently readable. There is nothing of musty, stuffy pedantry in it, and yet it yields a wealth of fresh information. To cite but one instance, the author proposes, on the basis of recent studies of ancient documents, a very satisfying solution to the famous difficulty regarding the dates of the Last Supper and of the day after, on which Jesus died.

The Popular Edition can be warmly recommended to priest and layman. It should prove particularly helpful to priests who wish to recommend to the laity an objective life of our Lord which is scholarly and readable, and of moderate length and cost.

FRANK B. NORRIS

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE PARISH. Edited by Celestine J. Nuesse and Thomas J. Harte, C.SS.R. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1951. Pp. xii+354. $4.50.

The sociology of religion has various facets and this book deals with one of them: the sociology of the parish. It does not aim at the provision of original insights into parish life but is, instead, a well-planned but somewhat pedestrian introduction which might be used as a textbook for undergraduate college classes, but which will be especially useful to priests and others who, not being sociologists, nevertheless wish to know how sociology concerns itself with Catholic parish life, and how it may be brought to yield a better understanding of the form and functioning of parish organization.

The editors have written a joint introduction and one chapter each. The balance of the book is the work of thirteen contributors, each on a different topic. Obviously not all of them are equal in insight or skill of presentation, and equally obviously not all of them have carried forward the precise planning of the book. As with most books written by many contributors, there is the defect of unevenness which somewhat counterbalances the value of having chapters written by specialists in their respective fields and with their varying styles.

Part One, provided by two historians, on the development of the form of the modern parish and the history of parishes in the United States, places the object matter of *The Sociology of the Parish* in its correct perspective. Part Two, entitled: "Parish Organization in American Communities," provides chapters on the social structure of the parish; the parish in rural and urban communities respectively (though the former is general and with statistics that are out of date, and the latter refers mainly to one parish in the District of Columbia); racial and national parishes; and parish societies (this chapter being more enumerative than dynamic). Part Three states some empirical problems of social research about parish groups, what parish census-taking involves, and some elementary notions of survey-planning. Part Four departs from sociology and goes into ideas on the "Pastoral Ministry in Transition," and "The Missionary Role of the Parish."

One wonders if the author of the "Missionary Role in the Parish" was not mistaken in the Mission de France affiliation of the priest whose evening Mass he attended (p. 318). In *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, XI, 1, p. 20, another writer who had travelled with that author mentioned having attended a Mass said by a priest of the Mission de Paris, and this certainly was a mistake, for Canon Hollande, the head of the group, specifically told this reviewer in the summer of 1950 that no outsider has ever been allowed or will be